

*Wm. Curtis, Noyes Esq.
50 Wall St.*

*With the respect of
H. B. Smith*

BRITISH SYMPATHY

WITH

AMERICA.

A REVIEW OF THE COURSE OF THE LEADING PERIODICALS OF
GREAT BRITAIN UPON THE REBELLION IN AMERICA.

BY

HENRY B. SMITH, D.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

PUBLISHED IN THE JULY NUMBER OF THE AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW,
PROF. H. B. SMITH, EDITOR.

New-York:

PUBLISHED BY W. H. BIDWELL,

No. 5 Beekman Street.

1862.

American Theological Review.

No. XIII.

CONTENTS OF THE JANUARY NUMBER, 1862.

A PORTRAIT OF THE REV. GARDINER SPRING, D.D.

I. ESSAYS AND REVIEWS.

ARTICLE I.—THE THEOLOGICAL SYSTEM OF EMMONS, - - - - -	7
II.—THE ANTE-NICENE TRINITARIANISM. By Prof. R. D. Hitchcock, D.D.,	54
III.—MEMORIAL OF THE AMERICAN BOARD. By Dr. Worcester, - - -	82
IV.—THE TWO SCHOOLS OF PHILOSOPHY. By Tayler Lewis, LL.D., -	102
V.—GARDINER SPRING, D.D., AND THE BRICK CHURCH, N. Y., - - -	135
VI.—THE BEAUTY OF HOLINESS, - - - - -	142

II. THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Codex Sinaiticus—Discoveries in Asia Minor—Jewish Literature. GERMANY: Luther's Monument—Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theologie—Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift—other German theological quarterlies—Döllinger—Biographical Works, etc. HOLLAND: The Four Theological Parties—Scholten, etc. FRANCE: Lacordaire—Migne's Collections— <i>Revue Chrétienne</i> — <i>Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne</i> —New Works—Paris Press. ITALY: Passaglia—New Manuscripts—Mazzini—Nicolini—Michel Angelo, etc. GREECE: Common Schools—Mixed Marriages—Bishops and Bibles. ENGLAND: Journal of Sacred Literature—British and Foreign Evangelical Review—Other Reviews—Wesleyan Literature—New Works, etc. SCOTLAND: Stewart's New System—Douglas of Cavers, etc. UNITED STATES: North American and other Reviews—New Works—Oriental Society—Danville Quarterly, - -	157
--	-----

III. LITERARY AND CRITICAL NOTICES OF BOOKS.

BIBLICAL LITERATURE: Macdonald's Pentateuch—Lange's Matthew Translated—Trench's Seven Churches in Asia—Ellicott's Life of Christ—Hopkins's Spots on the Sun—The Book of Psalms. THEOLOGY: Keerl, Der Mensch, das Ebenbild Gottes—Réville, <i>Essais de Critique Religieuse</i> —Tracts for Priests and People—Hudson's Debt and Grace—Walker's Sermons—Huntington's Year of Church Work—Butler's Theology—Stewart's Free-Will Baptists—Ball on Baptism. THE CHURCH AND ITS HISTORY: Frederick William IV on Church Government—Dorner's Person of Christ—Chrystal's Baptism—Hagenbach's History of Doctrines—Gieseler's Church History—HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY: Hopkins's Puritans—May's Constitutional History of England—Schmidt's Melancthon—Uhlhorn's Urbanus Rhegius—Memoirs of Prof. Bush—Baehring and Gelzer on Bunsen. BOOKS OF TRAVEL: Andersson's Okavango River—Last Travels of Ida Pfeiffer. GENERAL LITERATURE: Marsh on the English Language—Zengler, <i>Bibliotheca Orientalis</i> —Works of Lord Byron—Titcomb's Lessons in Life—Davidson's Elijah—The Partisan Leader—Reade's Cloister and Hearth—Brooks, The Silver Cord—Wills, Notice to Quit—Streaks of Light—Eclectic Magazine—Harper's Magazine. POLITICAL AND CIVIL QUESTIONS: Rice, Our Country, and the Church—Dall, Woman's Rights—Lord on National Currency—Ellison's Slavery in the United States—Addresses and Discourses by Prentiss, Hitchcock, Henry, Walker, Dunning, and Magie, - - -	174
--	-----

IV. STATISTICS, AND CHURCH NEWS.

Population of the Globe—Cost of War—European Cities—The Evangelical Alliance. UNITED STATES: American Board—Statistics of Presbyterian and German Reformed Churches—Southern Presbyterians—Synod of New York and New Jersey on the War. CANADA: Census—Newfoundland—Nova Scotia. ENGLAND: Census—Popular Education—Contributions—Church-Rate Bill—Increase of Bishoprics—Congregationalism. SCOTLAND: Free Church. IRELAND: Census. FRANCE: Public Worship—Education—Protestant Churches. SPAIN: Census—Education. ITALY: St. Peter's Pence—Statistics of Rome—Convents in Perugia. ASIA: Protestantism in Siam, - - -	192
--	-----

24

COLL.

ART. V.—BRITISH SYMPATHY WITH AMERICA.

THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW. No. LXXXI. February, 1862. Art. X.
THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC: RESURRECTION THROUGH DISSOLUTION.

WAR tries and reveals the strongest elements of national character, developing in an accelerated ratio the physical and moral resources of a people. In itself an evil and a scourge, it may become the means of purifying and exalting the popular spirit and of bringing a nation to the fullest consciousness of its historic destiny. It may likewise become an international touchstone, revealing the sympathies or antipathies of other nations. The sentiments that are cloaked in times of peace are often evoked with unmistakable significance when a nation is struggling for its very life. We find out who are our real friends, and who they are that wish us ill, when engaged in a contest that absorbs all our energies. Especially must this be the case, when a nation, like our own, is involved in an intestine conflict, striving to uphold its national unity in the face of a formidable revolt. At such a crisis the broad human and Christian sympathies of other nations will be clearly expressed, if not by the proffer of material aid, yet in the way of moral support, of cordial cheer and good-will.

Such magnanimous and unbought sympathy, uttered in the

juncture and crisis of a nation's destiny, has a priceless worth ; it is the noblest boon which one people can give another. It cannot be extorted by menace, nor is it the offspring of mere prudence, but rather a spontaneous tribute, revealing the subtlest and deepest moral unison in the great ends and objects of national life. It indicates where lie the springs of action. As with an electric touch it kindles the souls of those engaged in the battle, for it assures them that the hearts of a vast and eager assembly are beating for them, quick to mourn their reverses and to hail their success. And, if such sympathy really exist, it will be shown most clearly whenever moral right and human rights are essential elements in the conflict. War, then, in Bacon's phrase becomes, "the highest trial of Right". And a nation contending for order against anarchy, for civilization against barbarism, for freedom against oppression, has some right to expect that the friends of order, of civilization, and of liberty will cheer it in its struggles and sacrifices. If it is itself willing to risk all, even its very life, for the sake of its vital interests, it may surely hope that those who share in its general principles and aims will pronounce judgment in its favor in clear and welcome words. And rarely, at such a juncture, can it be mistaken about the sentiments and sympathies of others. The nerves are in tension, and quick to feel. Love, hate or indifference is rapidly detected when the soul is strained to its highest pitch of sensibility.

The United States of America are now involved in a desperate conflict, which, to all human seeming, indicates a crisis in its history. It is passing through a death-struggle, resisting even unto blood the domination of the slave power in its national affairs, the arbitrary and self-destructive theory of secession as a constitutional right, and the armed hosts of a widespread rebellion, fomented in the interests of a slaveholding minority, and having for its object the establishment of a rival republic based on the right of human bondage as its distinguishing political principle. The leaders in this rebellion are conspirators, traitors and rebels against the General Government ; none the less so even though the political right of secession be conceded. For they took forcible possession

of forts, public buildings, and lands owned by the United States; they attacked posts rightly held by national troops; they subjected to systematic persecution and confiscation all loyal persons within the boundaries of the so-called Confederate States; they annulled the laws of the land; they attempted to overrun and hold States which had never seceded; they threatened to take and destroy the national Capitol. All this is not mere secession; but open and flagrant insurrection against the power and rights of the General Government. And that this rebellion was inaugurated in the service of slavery, for the sake of founding a slave-republic on this continent, and brought about chiefly because the progress of the North threatened to expel the domination of the slave-power from our national councils, is as palpable to all who can read the signs of the times, and as susceptible of the clearest historic and moral demonstration, as any fact in the course and progress of human history. Here is the inmost sense of the strife. The central question in our politics for more than forty years has been, Shall freedom or slavery rule in our national policy? The question now is, Shall a republic, based on the principle of slavery, be allowed to consolidate its power on the soil of this republic? And the question in its final issue is, Shall this continent, south of the Canadian frontier, be controlled by the generous and inspiring principle of free labor, or by the selfish and barbarising policy of slavery? For in the end there can probably be but one government in the heart of this continent, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Secession could only end in attempts at reconstruction. If a slave-republic were now formed as an independent power, it would never cease its ambitious projects until it brought the whole country under its sway. The physical characteristics of the country, the laws of commerce, the historic laws guiding the growth of states, the common bonds of language, literature, and society, and the general interests of this country in relation to foreign powers, all point to national unity as the only feasible end. Here it is eminently true, that

“ They struggle vainly to preserve a part,
Who have not courage to contend for all”.

One country, one constitution, one destiny is sharply inscribed upon the past annals of our nation, and prognosticated in the signs of the future. Whether the vast power of this republic shall be wielded in the interests of freedom or of slavery, of an aristocracy or of the people, whether unrighteous caste shall here be perpetuated or here be abolished, is the vital and substantive question at the root of our present conflict.

Animated by such convictions the United States entered into the war which the rebellion forced upon it, with the fullest consciousness of its significancy, perils, and possible issues. It saw that its national life was in danger of extinction, and it nerved and strained itself to call out all its resources for self-preservation. It was suddenly summoned to a new and untried career—from the *acta in toga* to the *gesta in armis*. It knew that the conflict would be desperate; and that the sacrifices must be in proportion to the danger and the stake. It knew that if it failed, republicanism itself would be pronounced a failure, and the onward career of this country be checked in its noon-tide. It also knew that if it succeeded, the progress of the slave-power would be arrested, the majesty of rightful government vindicated, the practical vigor of republicanism demonstrated, and its progress accelerated. On the one side was an armed revolt, assuming the style of Confederate States, organized to expel the national government from its soil, and to ensure the undisturbed supremacy of the debasing political maxim, that human bondage is needful and right. On the other hand was the National Government, legally elected, simply exercising its constitutional functions, foully betrayed by those entrusted with power, aiming only to uphold in the revolted States the authority and rights to which those States were solemnly pledged, menaced and warred upon because the national supremacy of the free spirit of the North seemed insured by the election of President Lincoln, long reluctant to believe that all hope of compromise and pacification must be abandoned, itself at first well-nigh non-resistant, while staggering and deadly blows were dealt by armed, wary, and unscrupulous foes, and at last aroused to open resistance only

when a handful of its troops, beleaguered in Fort Sumter, were compelled to surrender their post after a fierce bombardment. Now the Union must fight or die. And thus our war began.

Up to this time the tone of the foreign, especially of the English press and periodicals, had been favorable to the United States government. The North was encouraged; the South was blamed. England had freed its colonial slaves, and boasted of its love and sacrifices for human freedom. For a quarter of a century it had been assailing this country chiefly because it was the only Christian power that tolerated slavery at home. British Christians catechised all our ministers upon this question, and refused the right hand of fellowship to such as could not clear themselves of the suspicion of looking upon the slave system with leniency or indifference. All Europe understood that the last presidential election turned upon the question of the prohibition of slavery in the territories—in fact, upon the question, whether the slave interest should be national or local. Abroad the election of Mr. Lincoln was well nigh universally hailed as an indication that the power of slavery was broken, and that the free North would exercise in our national councils the supremacy to which it was entitled by its numerical superiority, and by its devotion to free labor, free speech, and human rights. The Great Republic was greeted as disenthralled from the fatal spell that had so long held it in bondage to a system, which sacrificed the general welfare to the exorbitant demands of a slaveholding minority and oligarchy.

But no sooner was the rebellion fairly inaugurated by the Confederate States, than all this applause was suddenly changed into doubt, reproach, or denunciation. The disruption of the Republic seemed to be assumed as a foregone conclusion. Apologies were invented for the South, and calumnies for the North. The war was “deplored” (the pet word) as a terrible struggle for a chimerical and undesirable result. The lust of conquest was stigmatised as the moving spring of the North, and the love of independence applauded as the passion of the South. The right of Secession was violently maintained by journalists that had evidently never seen our

Constitution. Slavery, it was squarely asserted, had really nothing to do with the strife. It was even gravely maintained that if Englishmen wanted to see the slave-trade abolished, and emancipation made sure and easy, they must sympathise with the Confederate States. The vaunted British sympathy, more often extolled than tested, for the weaker and oppressed party, was invoked in favor of the persecuted Southern States, who only wanted to secure their independence. Besides, if the South succeeded, republicanism was surely a failure, as sagacious Englishmen had always said it must be. Also, if the South succeeded, it would have free trade with England, and free trade is a very great blessing—for England, which has so many manufactured goods to sell in the dearest markets, and raw goods to buy in the cheapest. And would it not after all be better to have the new slave republic succeed (especially as it had prohibited the slave-trade), than to have the Great Republic subdue it; for in the latter case, the power of republicanism would be proved mightier than that of any other form of government; whereas, if the South established its independence, it would certainly need a stronger government than before, possibly an aristocracy in form as well as in fact—and this would go to show that aristocracy is conducive to the well-being of states. Even if it were a slave republic, that would not make any Englishman love slavery more; whereas, if the United States triumphed, and all the States were reunited as one free republic, this would give greater warrant and license than ever before to the insolent radical faction under “our venerable constitution” who have been trying to prove by Western example, that the masses may wisely be entrusted with a greater share of that political power, which all conservatives hold should be administered, not by the people, but for them. Some ulterior consequences about Canada, the British West Indies, commercial supremacy, naval power, and kindred matters were also incidentally suggested to reflecting minds. The net result of the whole calculation was thus very clearly made out to be something like this: if the South succeed, England will be a gainer in divers ways (even though, parenthetically, hu-

manity be the loser); but if the North succeed, nobody can tell what may happen, though it is quite probable that the British Isles will not receive any immediate benefit. Serious-minded philanthropists were also prompted to inquire whether, after all, humanity would suffer so very much from the triumph of the South? There are surely men, and gentlemen and Christians (as well as cotton), there in abundance, in spite of their horrible system of slavery; and if they can only be brought into intimate fellowship with the British people, and bound to it by ties of gratitude—may it not reasonably be expected in the course of time that they would be persuaded to treat their poor slaves a little better? Moreover, may there not have been some gross exaggerations about this matter of slavery? The North is very jealous of the South; and it is plainly the interest of the planters to treat their chattels well, or else they could not produce so many bales of cotton of such a long and fine staple. Thoughtful English philanthropists and traders deeply pondered such obvious considerations. De Tocqueville is acknowledged to have written the best book on American Democracy; the same shrewd critic in his *Memoirs* also tells us: “In the eyes of an Englishman a cause is just, if it be the interest of England that it should succeed. A man or a government that is useful to England has every kind of merit, and one that does England harm every sort of fault.” He also adds, that it is “the conviction of all nations that England considers them only with reference to her own greatness, that she never notices what passes among foreigners, what they think, feel, suffer, or do—but with relation to the use which England can make of their actions, their sufferings, their feelings and their thoughts; and that when she seems most to care for them, she really cares only for herself”.*

This severe judgment of a philosophical observer seems to be confirmed by the course of the British people, as represented by the leading organs of public opinion, in relation to the present crisis in our national affairs. By the closest ties of descent, language, and commerce, by traditional regard for

* De Tocqueville, *Memoir, Letters, and Remains* (Boston edition), ii, 393.

the authority of constitutions and by the inborn love of human rights, as well as by treaties of amity, they were allied to our General Government. When the rebellion broke out, the whole North felt and said, England will surely give us its moral support. And this on two grounds, if on no other; first, the maintenance of the rightful authority of a constitutional government against the assaults of perjured conspirators and traitors; and, secondly, in the interest of human freedom as against the retrograde tendencies and inherent selfishness, if not barbarity, of the slave power.* Here we supposed were fixed facts as to the side to which England would gravitate in its political and moral sympathies. But it was soon found that we were imposed upon by the delusions of a dream. As with one consent, the leading journals representing the aristocratic, the commercial, and also the religious opinions of Great Britain, began to show the most inexplicable dislike of the United States, and to pour out upon it a torrent of abusive misrepresentation and perversion of principles and facts, almost unequalled in the fiercest excitement even of a local, political debate. The amount of stupid prejudice and obstinate ignorance about our affairs shown by these journals is well-nigh incredible. All the old scores of the past fifty years were raked up to inflame popular prejudice. Our institutions, history, morals, manners, and government were disparaged and vilified, as if no public or private virtue were left on this side of the ocean. Whatever the South said for itself or against the North was credulously believed; and all that the North said was ignored or denied. The tone of the British government itself was cold and diplomatic, and tended to favor the South alone. According to all recognised principles of international law, the

* Another reason might have been found in the Protestant sympathies of England, and the desirableness of upholding this Union unimpaired in the interests of our common Protestant civilization and power. If this country were dismembered, England would be the only first-rate Protestant nation. It requires but a slight knowledge of past history and of the probabilities of the future, to see that the conflict between Protestantism and Catholicism has not yet been decided; and that precisely on account of its Protestantism, the strongest European powers may yet seek to cripple the might of England.

only lawful army and navy which England had any right to see within our boundaries was that called out by the United States. But the British government at the very outset, even before the minister of our government could arrive in England, issued a proclamation, conceding belligerent rights to the revolted as much as to the loyal States. It assumed a position of neutrality between a lawful government and its rebellious citizens. It put the privateers of the latter on the same footing with our men-of-war. The Nashville wantonly destroyed the Harvey Birch by fire, and then found refuge and comfort in British ports: Earl Russell said it was a Confederate "vessel of war". Spain and Turkey have been more just than England. *The Times*, *The Morning Herald*, and *The Post*, followed by nearly all the leading journals (excepting *The Daily News* and *The Star*) have bitterly and constantly denounced the policy, the aims, the power and the right of our Government in the prosecution of the war. In the affair of the Trent, England ignored its old policy and claims, that it might put us in the wrong. The news of the seizure of that ship was followed by a furious outburst of indignation and hostility from Johnny Groat's to Land's End. The wildest surmises were current and credited about our intent and policy; as, the manufactured lie, that the government at Washington was under the dictation of a mob; or, the gross absurdity, that the North, hopeless of subduing the South, had put a deliberate insult upon England, that it might in its extremity embroil itself in another war, and so have a decent pretext for making peace with the rebels! The British lion could not have sprung to its feet with more instant rage even in the event of a French invasion; only it was in menace of a foe supposed to be powerless, and not in panic before an empire known to be strong. In hot haste a virtual ultimatum was despatched across the Atlantic, containing no hint of possible diplomatic negotiations even on points of international law plainly involved and not yet settled. To aid diplomacy, large reinforcements were at once shipped to Canada. In the extremity of our Republic, before we had completed our preparations for coping with the rebellion, ere we had

gained a single great victory, England sent us an ultimatum, and sent a large force to our borders in menace, while the whole British press poured out a volley of anathemas. Mr. Seward's note to Lord Lyons, indicating a pacific solution of the difficulty, was in the hands of the ministers of the crown, and its contents were carefully suppressed. And only the good sense of our government, and the moderation of our "mob", kept Old England from the unspeakable shame of making war upon a free Republic in the interests of a slave-holding confederacy. Then, of course, there came a lull in the storm, but still no concession to the justice or rights of our cause: there was silence, but no favor:

Turpiter obtineuit, sublato jure nocendi.

Of this attitude and public policy of England in respect to our struggle there is one, and only one possible solution, in consonance with all the facts of the case. The preëminence of Great Britain is the historical ideal of British statesmanship. This may spring from the latent conviction that English supremacy is for the greatest good of mankind; it is at any rate sufficiently powerful to absorb all minor morals and objects. The peculiarity of the British power, as compared with that of all other great historic nations, is seen in the fact that it is the only island which has ever ruled continents. The marvellous energy, pluck, good sense, and pertinacity of the British people have given it unequalled success in the planting and holding of colonies. It has also been able at home to combine the most diverse interests in one orderly and wonderful state. Monarchy, aristocracy, representative government, commerce, and manufactures are wrought into one system, making one power as never before. To support all these interests, to remain a great and growing power, it must have great colonies, and a proportionate maritime and commercial superiority. It lives and thrives through and by its possessions abroad. It is by necessity ambitious for foreign conquest and rule. Some of its interests, especially those of the aristocratic, the manufacturing, and the commercial classes, seem endangered by the example, or by the growing power,

of our Republic. Dread of this power, and of its future growth, controls the words and policy of many of England's greatest and best men. Our democracy is disliked by their aristocracy; our manufactures rival theirs; our commerce threatens at many points to supplant theirs. We are in dangerous proximity to some of their best colonies. They can hardly replace the drain we make upon their people by the superior advantages our land holds out to their more destitute population. In this state of things, what was more natural than that, in such a crisis as ours, all these threatened interests should rise up against us? Our hour had come; it was our time of rupture and of weakness; this Republic seemed rent asunder. Now, if ever, was the opportunity, without infringing on the letter of the public law, to make use of all practicable means for giving aid and comfort to the cause of secession, thus hastening the dissolution of the Union. In many ways this would be for the advantage of England. The United States would cease to be a first-rate power. Southern cotton could be directly exchanged for English manufactures. The need of a strong force in Canada and the West Indies would be curtailed; and the Monroe doctrine would become a dead letter. It would also be proved, that Republics tend to subdivision. Thus the material and commercial prosperity of Great Britain might be enhanced, and its aristocracy have a new lease of power, both in church and state.

Two considerations, as we have already stated, stood in the way of all this. One was the regard which one nation should have for another struggling for national existence. The other was, that the rebellious States were slaveholding, and England was committed to abolitionism. Here were the moral principles of the contest; this was its other, higher, and eternal side. Could England afford to throw these out of the account? Should it suppress the moral instincts, and give heed only to political and mercenary aspirations? Would this redound to its permanent benefit? Here was certainly a grave dilemma. And the leading British statesmen and writers extricated themselves from it by a very simple plan and plea. With one consent, they took the ground, that neither of these considerations was

to enter into their estimate of the case in hand. It was quietly assumed, as inevitable and irrefragable—that there was no one national life, no national unity here, and that there ought not to be—that the South and the North were already two nations: and that the only possible issue of the contest was on this basis. And it was also as roundly asserted and claimed—in direct contradiction of the most notorious facts—that slavery had nothing to do with the real merits of the case; that freedom, in fact, would rather lose than gain with the triumph of the North. And so the English hatred of slavery was even paraded as a reason for sympathising with the South rather than the North. Earl Russell, echoed by Mr. Gladstone, summed up the whole matter in the noted saying—“that the contest was, on the part of the North, for supremacy, and on the part of the South for independence”. Thus were the only two reasons on the ground of which the United States entered into the conflict ruled out of the case in England.

Yet not wholly ruled out by all. A seeming consistency must still be attempted. Hence we were told, again and again, that if we would put the war on direct anti-slavery grounds, and proclaim universal emancipation, all England would rise in virtuous acclamation. That is to say, we will and can have no sympathy with you in your struggle for national being, for we can only sympathise with a universal human interest. We will not sympathise with you, if you conduct your war on the same principles and for the same objects with all the most defensible and lauded wars in history, but only as you make it a moral crusade, and propagate freedom at the point of the bayonet. Suppose we had done this; would not the cry of fanaticism, of the horrors of extermination, of the impracticability of such a daring venture, have rung through Europe? Would not France and England have been exhorted to interfere on the score of humanity itself? And, besides, if England is so virtuous that it can only sympathise with a war for moral ends, what must it say of its own wars, in India, in the Crimea, in Canada? Were these for freedom or for empire? Let it also be considered, that,

from the nature of the case, the legal and political form and statement of the contest must be, the necessity of preserving the constitution and the government. It is the only possible mode of putting the case in political ethics, as a national cause. The war, as an appeal to arms, was forced upon us by an armed revolt and rebellion against our government. The momentum was indeed given on the one side by slavery, on the other by freedom. But the only direct and formal object of the war on the part of the Union is, of course, to restore its own authority. Slavery as a predominant power in our national politics will doubtless receive its death-blow in the contest; but this must be, not through the war alone and directly, but also through many another agency.

Now we do not doubt that many Englishmen truly believed that we had no right to contend for national existence, and that they could not sympathise with us unless we adopted their visionary scheme of emancipation. They really thought that we were engaged in an unrighteous war of subjugation alone. But may this not have been in part because they wished to believe it? *Populus vult decipi, et decipietur*. The wish was father to the thought. They did not want to find that the North was in the right. They did not wish to feel obliged to sympathise with us on the score of good government and of anti-slavery feeling. It was much more convenient to set these moral aspects of the case aside, that the prudential and commercial reasons might have full vent and verge. For, whatever may be said about English justice and sympathy, there is and can be no question (with a few exceptions), that on neither of those two main points of our controversy have we had the slightest expression of good-will from the leading organs of British opinion. Mr. Mill, in his very able article in *Fraser's Magazine*, confesses that there is too much plausibility to the accusation that the English people have felt and spoken "almost solely against the party in the right"; and that there is "no denying the charge, that our moral attitude towards the contending parties" has favored the slave interest. They have called the struggle deplorable: but only to add, that they wished we would make peace with and recognise the South, so

that they might again get cotton and send goods in abundance. On the two main points they have had no sympathy with us, because they have denied both of them as real factors in the contest. They even taunt us with asking for their sympathy, as if it was none of their business. We do not complain of it ; we suppose they could not help it. It is not their lack of charity that we impugn, so much as their falsification of facts ; it is not their want of sympathy, but their reasons for it. They did not, and would not see the immortal issues of the strife. We simply say, that it reveals to us fully, what are English policy and statesmanship, English hopes and fears, in the midst of such momentous contests. But we also insist upon it, that they have no right to call prudence virtue, and to dignify mercantile calculations with the sacred name of justice. If England in this matter is content with its position, and vindicates its wisdom, so be it. Only let it be fully understood, that it finds its honor in what is for its own advantage, and its wisdom in that which will most profit its own power and commerce. But as yet we cannot see that mercantile morality is the highest form of national ethics ; we cannot see that England has any sense or reason or justice on its side, in utterly disregarding all that the United States of America declare with unanimous conviction to be the inmost sense of the real issues of this terrible war—perhaps the most vast in its proportions, and momentous in its results, of any single war that was ever waged on any continent, having respect to the maintenance of good government and of just and equal laws. And England's very lack of sympathy for us has made us stronger. It has disclosed to us still more clearly, that here we stand well-nigh alone, fighting a battle for mankind.

That those esteemed the best and worthiest of English statesmen held and favored such views, adverse to our national unity, and resolutely refusing to admit the slavery question into the discussion, is seen most clearly in the utterances of leading members of the British Cabinet. From Lord Palmerston no one, we suppose, expected much favor ; he has spoken no good word for America, though he lately said, that “ he should be ashamed, when events of such high importance

were going on in *Italy*, if Englishmen had remained silent, and expressed no feeling, no wishes and no sympathy as to the result." Mr. Milner Gibson uttered a few words at the outset in favor of the North. Her Majesty's Secretary for Foreign Affairs has been identified with the progress of reform; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer is, undoubtedly, a man of the highest general culture. The former openly said, in his place in the House of Lords, in the very height of our conflict: "I trust that whatever may be their military successes and naval victories, the North will at last consent to the *peaceable separation of two States*, which might both be mighty, of two States inhabited by persons of very different education and of very different nature, perhaps, but respecting each other, and each going on in a course of peace and prosperity, which will not only benefit that great country in the present day, but will secure its position for centuries to come." From Earl Russell's point of view, all this may have seemed very fair and conclusive; and many Englishmen praise its moderation and justice; but suppose our Secretary of State had said the same thing about England and Canada, or England and India, while these countries were in rebellion against the British power. Or, suppose Ireland should revolt, and Mr. Seward should utter a like wish. Mr. Seward, the most philosophical of our statesmen, has been represented in England as the chief of our demagogues, on the basis of notoriously false reports of his sayings as to Canada. But the South is held to us by closer ties, and is more needful to our national unity than Canada can be to England. Mr. Gladstone not only endorses the general position of Earl Russell, but he is still more explicit in the avowal, that the English policy was dictated by a desire to conciliate the South, in the belief that it would finally succeed. In his speech before the Chamber of Commerce at Manchester he repelled "the American demand for sympathy", asking what was "practically the meaning of that desire and demand? It was this, that we should take such a course by our language and by our public acts as would place the ten millions of men of the South in permanent hostility with us". He goes on to say, that though opposed to slavery, "that is no

reason for adopting a course of conduct that is to lay the foundations of alienation, of bad feeling, and of permanent hostility between ourselves and those who may hereafter be a great nation claiming to enter into peaceful relations with us".* This is certainly very frankly said. And, making all due allowance, is not such a statement as this a melancholy commentary on the British statesmanship of the nineteenth century? Why has it been left to Mr. Bright, the noble Quaker, and to Mr. Mill, the reflecting political economist, to utter the only words which indicated any tolerable appreciation of the real magnitude and issues of this contest? The whole tone of Mr. Gladstone's Manchester speech is unmistakably in favor of the Southern cause. On the question of slavery in general, the Chancellor is very sound; but he says he has "no faith in the propagation of free institutions at the point of the sword". Why did he not state it just the other way — that he has no faith in the propagation of slavery, at the point of the sword? for that was the beginning of the strife. And between the two—for this is the question—which would he elect? When slavery rises against a free government, how can either government or freedom be preserved but by the sword? The whole amount of his argument is, the South will probably succeed, and therefore we must keep on good terms with her. Has British statesmanship, then, ceased to be a training in the high rules of political justice, and in a sacred jealousy for whatever may mar human freedom and human rights, and become debased into a mercantile morality, a caculation of profit and loss? Well might the rulers of the Southern Confederacy rejoice when they read such words. If they could only succeed, they would be sure there would be no "alienation or bad feeling" among England's ruling minds. Whatever might be their crimes against the United States, and whatever their "domestic institutions", the chief opponent of slavery in

* The tone of Mr. Gladstone's Manchester speech is very different from that of the one he delivered some time since at Leith, in which he said that "not only had England nothing to fear from the growth of the United States of America, but so far as we had a selfish interest at all in the matter, it was that the American Union should continue undisturbed". Whence this marked difference?

the old world would be most happy to enter into "peaceful relations" with them at the earliest opportunity. It is not alone the heart of the North which is indignant at such avowals and such policy; but the voice of England's "dead, yet sceptred sovereigns," in the name of its dearest and mightiest memories, equally rebukes these sordid calculations, based on the prospective calamities of a people sprung from England's loins, and inheriting her old spirit.

"Milton! thou should'st be living at this hour:
England hath need of thee."

Might not even a merely prudential statesmanship have also asked, whether, even if the South succeeded, it would not be prudent for England to retain its moral hold of the great Northern Republic, which would still remain indestructible? * Might it not be as well to conciliate twenty-two millions of freemen as four millions of a slaveholding population? England had a great opportunity of riveting this Republic to it by the strongest bonds. We did not ask its intervention in our behalf; we merely asked, that it might not stimulate the hope of intervention in favor of the South. Every one knows that this hope has been the chief reliance of the South in continuing the contest. Mr. Seward long since wrote to Mr. Pike, Minister at the Netherlands, and has often repeated, that "this domestic war would come to an end to-morrow if the European States should clearly announce, that—expectations of favor from them must be abandoned". And what statesman, on either side of the Atlantic, doubts, that, if the North had not shown an unparalleled energy, and been successful under a favoring Providence beyond precedent, intervention by this time would have been ensured, to our discomfiture and the triumph of the Confederate States? Such an intervention would have been in palpable violation of all international law

* Mr. Bright warned his countrymen in vain on this point: "It is worth our while, on all moral grounds, and on grounds of self-interest, that we should in all our transactions acknowledge our alliance and kinship with such a nation, and not leave behind an ineradicable and undying sting, which it would take many years, perhaps a generation or two, to remove".

and right, and yet it has been seriously advocated, on the most frivolous pretexts. It has been discussed as if this country were a second-rate or enfeebled power, at the mercy of the great European States; it has been urged for the sake of humanity, as though we were half-civilized; it was suggested for the absurd reason, that, to aid our blockade, we sunk old hulks in the harbor of Charleston; and it has been demanded, in the name of the suffering operatives of Lancashire, as though all regard for our national dignity and rights were to be made subservient to the interests of British operatives. Mr. Gladstone congratulates the English nation on this non-intervention, saying, "that there never was an occasion in which the civilized nations of the world bore, and had been content to bear, so much real misery, resulting from a civil and municipal quarrel in another State, without interference". But what principle of international ethics allows intervention in such cases of incidental suffering from war? There can be no great war which is not inconvenient to the non-combatants. If they can on that account justly interfere, there could not be any war between two great powers without leading to universal war. The assumed right of intervention is preposterous. But not more so than it is for Englishmen to extol their magnanimity for not committing so gross an injustice. They have called their neutrality dignified, and eulogised their indifference to a conflict which is to decide whether this continent be the home of freedom or the land of bondage! When Dante was on the verge of the infernal regions, he heard a sad wail, and turned and asked, who were these. To whom it was replied, that they were the shades of those who were indifferent to good and evil, and deserved neither praise nor blame, and therefore were their cries mingled with those of the rebel angels. The boasted neutrality of England mingles accordant with the fierce war-cry of the rebel hosts of America, bent on our destruction.

In all this, we say, England has let slip a great opportunity of showing itself faithful to its loudly proclaimed principles. It has been tried and found wanting. It may be, that like us, it was, though unconsciously, passing through a moral crisis.

It may be, that its own hour of danger is not distant, when it will look in vain for the sympathy from us it would otherwise have surely had. The change of feeling in this country has been rapid, strong, and well-nigh universal. Those have changed the most who were England's firmest friends. It is the reflecting, conservative, and religious men of the North who are now most distrustful of her whom we have always called our mother country. The Anti-British feeling has hitherto been strongest among the democrats, seeking the votes of the immigrant Irish population. Now, the estrangement is most marked among the most sober men of all political parties and religious denominations. It is not hatred or fear; but a deep-seated moral distrust. Our best men are amazed at England's indifference, if not apostasy, to the moral bearings of this conflict. They doubted whether it could be so, until the evidence became irresistible. We found ourselves traduced by those who ought to have uttered words of cheer; we listened in vain to hear any one great name among England's ruling statesmen, and even among the clergy of Presbyterian Scotland, pronounce boldly in our favor. Arthur, Bright and Mill, are the only three men of note who have really worked with vigor in our behalf. Of Mr. Cobden, once our eulogist, all that we have heard is, that he was perpetually asking, on free-trade grounds, why we could not let the Southern States go in peace. Bulwer, the reflecting novelist and statesman, early prophesied our inevitable ruin as a united people. And even Lord Brougham, whose speech is just received in this country, abstaining from an expression of opinion in favor of either party, describes this war as "the frantic rage of a whole people, filled with a thirst for vengeance, only to be slaked by each other's slaughter"; manifestly thinking that, not regular armies, but a whole population is fighting hand to hand like savage tribes. And this venerable apostle of freedom, and of the diffusion of knowledge, "improves" the occasion to depict the terrors of democracy, in which the government is overborne by the mob, and likens the government to Pontius Pilate, and the people to the mob that demanded the death of Jesus. Such a

speech confounds and amazes us; for it shows the utter ignorance of the most intelligent foreigners as to the real character and working of democratic institutions. Everybody here knows that these representations are utterly false; and we tell our English friends so, and they do not give the slightest heed to our testimony. How different the tone of the more thoughtful and less prejudiced Frenchmen. De Gasparin and Laboulaye have spoken manfully in our favor; but there has been no Scotch De Gasparin, and few English Laboulayes. Archbishop Dupanloup published a pastoral against slavery;* what English prelate has done the like? Hengstenberg hates a democracy so cordially, that we are not surprised to find him exulting in our division, and in his joy forgetting to rebuke the sin of rebellion; but from Dr. Guthrie we did not look for revilings at our institutions and insulting denial of our anti-slavery professions. In days past large public meetings have been held in England in favor of Italy striving for unity, and of Hungary contending its nationality. But America must fight for unity and nationality alone, without the encouragement of any such spontaneous assemblage. We may have had many secret friends; silent, reflecting, and Christian men may have been with us; but the feeling has not been strong enough, and the men have not been strong enough to be outspoken. We have seen private letters from those eminent in literature or

* Mgr. Dupanloup, archbishop of Orleans, is an ardent advocate of the rights of the papacy, but he does not forget the rights of man. In his recent address to his clergy, he says: "I am told that the North merits little more of sympathy than the South; that questions of commercial tariffs or of political predominance have had more influence than the question of slavery on the secession out of which civil war has issued." . . . "It is said, that if the Union be reconstructed, the emancipation of the slaves is not certain, and if the separation become complete, that emancipation is not impossible." . . . "All this I do not know . . . but what I do know is, that the horrors of civil war have been let loose by this fearful question. . . . And what I am more happy to know is, that by a recent and important act, a message of March 8, sent to Congress by the President of the United States and adopted by a great majority — measures prudent, equitable, peaceful, have been proposed to put an end to slavery, and passed. . . . For the first time in sixty years the central government takes part, and commits the whole nation to a vigorous effort against the evil." Suppose the lord bishop of Oxford had uttered such words in the English Parliament!

for philanthropy, breathing a cordial sympathy with us; and these were doubly grateful just because they were in such strong contrast with almost all the public manifestoes. Prince Albert, we do not forget, was reckoned as our friend at the time when war seemed imminent. Several religious bodies, too, petitioned for peace; these, however, were all non-conformist, excepting the Evangelical Alliance, and Lord Shaftesbury himself protested against the action of the latter. But all this had to do, not with our internal struggle, but with adding to it a contest with England. So far as we can see or judge, from any public avowals, the simple matter of fact is, that the whole ruling class in England, in church and state, have prophesied and welcomed this American Crisis as the downfall of our Republic; and they were perfectly willing to see us lose our place among the nations of the earth.

But what, after all, if this Republic shall be successful, and be reunited, and have freedom and free labor for its ruling national character! Were there no Englishmen, of large thought and heart, to contemplate this possibility? Few, if any; and yet it was worthy of meditation.* It was well worth asking whether, in view of that contingency, England could afford to do outrage to the strongest patriotic instincts of a power that would at once be the strongest on this side of the Atlantic, and that would soon become second to no earthly power? But the great men of England have resolutely shut their eyes to any such possibility. They have not allowed this thought to influence their words. It is well for us that they are neither the

* The *Morning Post*, one of our most bitter assailants, lately said: "If the government of the United States should succeed in reannexing them (the Confederate States) to its still extensive dominions, Democracy will have achieved its grandest triumph since the world began. All that for fifty years its worshippers have declaimed and sung would be but dull prose to the pæans which would thenceforth ascend in its praise. It would be said, and not unjustly said, that it not only reared an empire as if by magic, but that when that empire was riven in twain — when an enemy, numbering its hosts by hundreds of thousands, was within sight of its Capitol, it was a question only of a little time, less bloodshed, and some money, to rebuild that empire by conquering nine millions of a united people, and a country of a million square miles."

Truth is sometimes couched in satire; ironical prophecies may have a fulfilment.

prophets nor the providence of history. Neither English hopes nor English fears will control our destiny as a nation. It is ruled by a higher power. Nor is it, as we joyfully and solemnly believe, in our own hands, or at any human disposal. No mere human will or wisdom were sufficient for such a boundless opportunity as will then stretch out before us. He alone who gives the opportunity can give the courage, wisdom, and strength needed for this unrivalled task. Were not the triumph of our Republic in the line of progress of human rights, human welfare, and also, above all, of Christ's own Gospel, we might well be more overawed at the prospect of victory, than at the prospect of dissolution or defeat. Even if defeated, we also know, that in some way, to us inscrutable, our reverse will subserve the behests of a higher power. But no fear of ultimate defeat now troubles our vision of the future. Never did a people gird itself for an almost superhuman task, with more of calmness, with more of self-sacrifice, with greater willingness, and even eagerness, to give up gold and life and all present earthly good, for the sake of man, for the sake of civilisation, and in obedience to the clearest indications and guidance of Providence. An inspiration of patriotism and unity, for the sake of freedom and humanity, seized as by a spontaneous energy upon the whole teeming population of the mighty and youthful Northern States. Such voluntary enlistments were never before known in a peaceful and civilized nation. The flower of our land, numbering hundreds of thousands, possessed by a mighty and uncontrollable impulse, have gone to battle as if it were a festal day. Disaster has given them fresh courage, and now the shouts of victory are heard all over the sea and land. The ranks, thinned by death, are still eagerly filled up. Six hundred thousand are now in the field; and before this nation will permit itself to be destroyed, another half million will gladly rush to the conflict. It may be "a chimera"; it may be fanaticism; but it is such a chimera as makes history; it is by such fanaticism that the world is subdued. Let us rather humbly call it a providential impulse, such as defies and enlightens the sagacity of the statesmen, traders and good men, who think everything

unaccountable that does not help their private gain, or square with their contracted horoscope of the future.

The strength and wide diffusion of this British feeling against the United States are still more manifest and inexplicable, as revealed in the great literary and religious organs of the country, where we naturally expect to find a more deliberate and matured expression of the real opinions of the thoughtful part of the nation. We care not to notice the persistent and venomous assaults, the malicious and almost frantic ravings of heartless if not mercenary journals, which have fomented ill-will against us by intolerable perversions and patent falsehoods; nor even such studied and flippant caricatures as the *Saturday Review* every week presents with infinite exaggeration and dexterous as well as sinister intent. But from the religious, and especially the quarterly journals, we might have expected more hesitancy and discrimination of denunciation. Yet with the single exception of the *London Review*, published by the Wesleyans, these periodicals are unanimous against the cause of the North, echoing the partial and perverted theories of Mr. James Spence, the Liverpool advocate of secession, in his work, *The American Union*, which has already reached a fourth edition.* The Rev. Wm. Arthur† deserves a testimonial from America for his noble deeds and words. But what shall we say of the pragmatic Dr. Campbell, of the *Standard*, who snubs our American divines in such a magisterial style, gravely assuring them that he knows a great deal more about our affairs than they possibly can; that "mist and darkness" have fallen upon all our eyes; and that "no power

* We see that a reply to it is announced by Mr. Charles E. Rawlins: *American Disunion: Constitutional or Unconstitutional?* Mr. Thos. Hughes is also one of the few Englishmen who have spoken the truth in a manful way. He writes: "Be sure that the issues are appreciated here, and while we see the awfulness of the task you have in hand, we have faith in you; we believe that if it can be done, you will do it, and we wish you, from the bottom of our hearts, God speed!" This has the old English ring in it. Mr. Hughes has also written on the *Struggle for Kansas*, in Mr. J. M. Ludlow's recent *History of the United States*. Mr. Cairns, of Glasgow, it is stated, is preparing a work on *The Slave Power*, with reference to American affairs.

† In the *London Review*, Oct. 1861, Jan. 1862.

on earth can alter his views". If he could only have a momentary vision of his characteristic arrogance, self-sufficiency, and dogmatic ignorance! Is it possible that he is a specimen of the average intelligence and sense of British Christians? Perhaps not; but then there is Dr. Vaughan, the leader of the Independents, the editor of the *British Quarterly Review*, the organ of Nonconformity, representing that body of English Christians most akin to us in religious and political sympathies; and he tells us that "remembering the past, we have no faith in the doctrine that the continuance of the colossal Union which has grown up over that vast territory is desirable. We feel convinced that some division, and perhaps more than one, would be favorable in many ways to the progress of international harmony and of Christian civilisation".*

The venerable *Christian Observer*, so long known and honored as the earnest advocate of evangelical Christianity and anti-slavery views, has also thrown the whole weight of its influence in the same direction. Its "first feeling" on hearing of the separation of the Slave States was one "of unmingled pleasure". It accused the North of being the cause of the war by "the invasion of Virginia". It advised England to have "a day of humiliation" on account of the "frenzy" of its "infuriate kinsmen" in the Northern States. The free States, it declared, "are losing their sense of justice and love of freedom". In one article it said, that England might have sympathized with the North if it had declared all the negroes free; in another article it averred that "manumission" would be like "an earthquake". It has professed neutrality, praised the Southern chivalry, applauded Lord Kinnaid's remark that "both parties were equally insincere", and summed up the matter by saying that "on both sides there is senseless and wicked slaughter". And such has been the burden of the pious *Observer's* notes on our affairs every month since the war began.

The *National Review* advocates liberal Christianity so-called, and is anti-slavery in its professions. In two articles (July 1861, and April 1862) it argues in favor of our disruption, describing us as "greedy, grasping, and overbearing"; accusing

* *British Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1862, p. 236.

us of "gigantic egotism", "self-worship and self-seeking"; asserting that "England finds itself unable to sympathize heartily with either rival", that she "cannot regret the disruption"; and that "as far as the mere policy of self-interest is concerned, it is the general wish in Europe that the Union shall *not* be restored". The *Westminster Review* is very impartial: "without nicely balancing the virtues of the contending sections, Englishmen cannot help believing that moderation, justice, and national honor, will find ample developments in a divided republic". The *Christian Remembrancer** stands for the High Church party, and of course says: "After long consideration and an attentive study of the bearings of the controversy, we assume the responsibility of saying, that the cause on whose side the *substantial justice* of the struggle preponderates, and that for whose success, in the interests of religion and also of our communion", [the Church of England!], "we ought as Englishmen to wish, is the cause of the Confederate States". It finds the justifying cause of secession in "the Navigation laws" and "sordid protectionism of the North"; and says that "if Slavery had been the one real grievance, the South need not and would not have seceded"! This simple ignorance just reverses the facts of the case; it indicates a refreshing willingness to believe anything a Southerner may say, by way of securing English sympathy. The same Review also assures us, that the South, the instant the "Northern blister was taken off, apparently cast off bunkum and exaggeration, spread-eagle and mendacity"! This was after reading Jeff. Davis's pious message, written on purpose to test the English gullibility; it seems to have worked like a charm. *Blackwood's Magazine* for April, which uses the terms "rascaldom" and "democracy" as synonyms, naturally says, that "the continuance of the Union is not to be desired, either for the sake of the Americans, or for our own". Were it not for its inborn aristocratic prejudices, it might be considered wilfully unkind, when it goes on and talks about "the tattered and insolent guise in which republicanism appears in America". After writing, in terms a little less than fair, that "only

* Jan. 1862, p. 234.

the grossest impudence could pretend to claim our sympathy for the North on the pretence that its people are making war against Slavery", it suddenly comes athwart President Lincoln's Emancipation message, but nothing daunted, it declares that this is only "a weak and impracticable attempt" "to secure the sympathy of foreign States by the pretence of a wish to make emancipation a part of the Federal policy". There is undoubtedly "gross impudence" somewhere in this matter; and we think that the writer has made it very plain just where it lies. Even the rival of *Blackwood*, the *Edinburgh Review*, avers that "the restoration of the Union has from the first been regarded in Europe as a chimera"; and that "in the public relations of States there is no room for sympathy or aversion". Is there, then, no such thing as national and international law and right? Are not States moral bodies? Cannot a community be just or unjust? If there may be justice or injustice, right or wrong, in State constitutions and State laws, then there is surely room for "sympathy or aversion" to all who are not deaf or dead to the voice of public conscience? Mr. Mill, in his work on *Representative Government* (p. 342), says of England, that "it has attained to more of conscience and moral principle in its dealings with foreigners than any other great nation seems even to conceive possible or recognise as desirable"; but this latest development of British policy, these unqualified statements of prominent reviews, that only interest and not conscience has a voice in international affairs, seem to indicate that the great utilitarian's theory has far outrun the facts.

The old *Quarterly Review** is instinctively faithful to its aversion to democratic government, and makes out a strong prophecy against our country. "We deplore", it says, "the war that is raging between the Federal and the Confederate States, but we doubt whether it is for the real interest of either that the whole of the North American continent, south of the frontier of Canada, should be held under one democratic government". Our "lust of territorial aggrandizement" has become so great as to threaten constant "collision with the na-

* On the American Crisis, Jan. 1862.

tions of Europe, which have interests on the other side of the Atlantic too great to be sacrificed to the ambition of one overweening power". It kindly suggests, that there is room enough here for "two or three or more powerful republics", which of course would keep one another in check. It reiterates the favorite British formula for our war, that "the contest on the part of the North now is undisguisedly for empire. The question of slavery is thrown to the winds". It is likewise confident that "the conquest of the South is a hopeless dream, and the reünion of the States in one all-powerful Republic an impossibility". This being borne in mind gives a zest to its kindly assurance that "no stronger proof could be given of the earnestness of our good-will towards America, than the desire so uniformly expressed in this country that the fratricidal war between the North and South should cease". That is to say, their good-will to us is shown in the fact, that they earnestly desire that we should be rent in twain. If Ireland should revolt from England, and the two countries should go to war, and we should say, that we thoroughly believed that the only result of the conflict must be the independence of Ireland, and that with this in view, we earnestly desired that the deplorable war might cease; we should thus be giving the most unmistakable evidence of our good-will towards—England. Does anybody imagine that such a thin veil of benevolence can hide unmitigated selfishness? A writer that can plume himself upon it must be badly off for matters of self-complacency. On a par with the benevolence of the venerable *Quarterly*, is also the sagacity of its theory as to the object of the North in continuing the contest. It is fighting "only to retrieve Bull Run"; when that is done "there will be peace and separation"; though it doubts whether even as much as that can be accomplished, judging by the way in which "the Confederate forces have been handled". But that was written six months ago. It has of course the usual rhetorical flourishes about "the cruel and vindictive destruction of Charleston harbor", which it declares is almost enough to tempt England to depart from its neutrality; it exhorts the European governments to "accelerate the recognition" of the Southern States "as the

readiest means of putting an end to a useless and cruel war"; it assures its readers that the blockade might be broken "without any violation of the Law of Nations"; and when the time for recognition has come, it is confident that England "will not delay an hour out of regard to all the menaces which the disappointed party may fulminate against us". Where in all this is there any trace of the boasted generosity and justice of English statesmanship? What fellow-feeling remains between that country, as represented by such writers, and our own? Malevolence itself could say and wish for nothing more, and still retain the thin semblance of a decent regard to the public justice of mankind. The swift undercurrent of the whole is the dread, if not the hate, of our Republic. The hardly suppressed joy gleaming through the whole is the rejoicing that our hour of weakness has come, and that our dissolution is drawing on apace. The policy recommended to England is that of taking advantage of our sore troubles to enhance its own power. Delay and non-interference are counselled because the end will be surely reached without the aid of foreign powers. Englishmen, from whom we have drawn the current of our life-blood, whose language we speak, whose laws and customs we inherit, whose free institutions are at the root of our own, gaze with indifference, if not with exultation, at the sad and terrible spectacle of a mighty nation, until now prosperous and beneficent to all its citizens beyond example, apparently tottering to its very base. They gather around the mighty fabric, and scan the fierce strife, and their shouts of cheer favor only the insurgents, while to us, in our extremity, they speak in tones of menace and of scorn. They see the traitorous hosts arrayed for our overthrow in violation of all their plighted faith, and seeking our destruction chiefly because this Republic has at length declared that it will not be the minister of slavery, but of freedom; and seeing this, they invent excuses and facts and arguments for the slaveholder, and reserve their anathemas, their threats, and their calumnies for the hosts of the free. And is this the voice of Old England, whom we venerated, as we venerated no other people, and from whose loins it was our boast that we sprung? Is England's heart turned to hate

against us, and has it no public conscience left? We cannot believe it. It is not the heart of England's people that thus speaks; but it is the heart, it is the voice of the class that now rules in state, in church, and in society. Below these there is another class, as yet heard only indistinctly; but whose voice when it breaks forth will be as the rushing of mighty waters. And that voice, the voice of the people, will be in unison with our own.

The general argument of the *Quarterly Review* against this country is based on the work of Spence, and is the same as that which we shall soon notice more fully. That slavery is not the cause of the war, that secession is justifiable, and that there is no hope of the restitution of the Union, are the main points. It knows so much about our Constitution, that it is "surprised" at the ignorance of Story and Curtis. It is very sure that the North was more ready to make and rivet the chains of the slaves, when the South seceded, than it ever was before; and consequently, that the secession was owing chiefly to geography, and to the fact that we were already two nations. Besides this, it sums up all the old grievances of England against this country, so as to inflame anew the popular prejudice, beginning with the war of 1812, and ending with the Trent case. In doing this it seems to outrun discretion, as well as historic justice; for the object of its argument is to show, that in all the cases alleged, the United States have come out in triumph, to the humiliation of England. The cases cited are, the war of 1812-15; the Ashburton treaty, 1842—calumniating Webster about the noted map, though it is well known that Sir Robert Peel declared him free from blame; the Oregon dispute, 1845-6; the Mosquito affair, 1856; the San Juan discussion, 1859; the Crimean enlistments, in which it grants that Crampton was "unwise"; and finally the affair of the Trent. As to the latter, it repeats the old story about the pressure of "the mob"—a pure fiction of transatlantic invention. Englishmen seem to think, because some of their most important discussions, as on Catholic emancipation, free trade and Chartism, were so strongly stimulated by the pressure of the rude democracy, that the same must

be the case in the national legislation of this country. How can we convince them that they are laboring under a profound delusion? In the history of our national Congress there is not a single instance of the kind, from the beginning until now. One of the noblest triumphs and vindications republicanism ever gained was in the yielding of this whole people to the deliberate determination of the General Government in the case of Mason and Slidell. That alone was proof enough of the capacity of a people for self-government. And throughout the whole of this war, the bearing of the people has been beyond all praise and all example. There never was such a trial of the power and safety of free institutions; and there never was such a triumph. The vast work we were called to do has been emphatically done by the people; the Government has been their executor. We firmly believe that no monarchy and no empire could have accomplished the work we are now carrying to its consummation. Republicanism has shown itself to be the strongest and the safest form of earthly power — the best able to meet a terrible crisis, to rally on the very verge of destruction, to concentrate men and means for the most arduous of conflicts, and to carry on the plans of a campaign, unequalled in vastness and difficulty, with a united, conscious, definite, and irresistible purpose. Other tests and trials are still before us; but the experience of the past year has given the best ground to believe, that, if the work be not superhuman, it can and will be accomplished; and this because it is a work involving the essential principles of government and of humanity, of human rights and righteous laws, and therefore appealing, as nothing else can, to the heart and conscience of every free-man, giving to each a personal interest in its successful issue. To sustain and build up a great and free Republic is a work for all, and to be done by all, and consequently it calls out the energy and wisdom of all, as nothing else may or can. Here is the secret of our past success, and an auspicious omen for the future. None but a universal human interest could have so united a whole people, and given it such conscious strength. England is incredulous as to our success, because it does not know the power of a Christian republic in a just cause. We

feel and know that we have only just begun to develop our real resources and unfold our real strength. We never knew it before. This year we are passing from the youth to the manhood of our nation's life. Now we are better able to understand our real historic destiny. In the fervor of conflict we have tested our thews and sinews. And, better than this, we have leaped to the full consciousness of our national unity and our national life. The soul of the nation has been kindled with a new fire upon the altar of sacrifice. This year of conflict has abounded in national blessings.

The most inexplicable instance of British apostasy in respect to our American crisis is, however, to be found in the *North British Review*, for February, 1862, in its article entitled, *The American Republic; Resurrection through Dissolution*. We might have foreseen the taunts of *Blackwood*, and the misrepresentations of the *Quarterly Review*; but we were totally unprepared to find in the organ of the Free Church of Scotland the most elaborate vindication of the cause of the seceded States, and the most calumnious and virulent attack upon the whole character, position, and policy of the American Union. We were surprised that no word of encouragement came to us from Scotland; we were still more astonished at the reports of the violent addresses of Dr. Guthrie and Dr. Hanna; but all this did not prepare us for the total change in the tone and temper of the *North British Review*. The *perfervidum ingenium Scotorum* here expends itself in unqualified abuse of our people, government, and institutions. Its article is greeted with the warmest applause by the strongest slaveholders of America. There is something in this which we confess we cannot fully comprehend. Scotchmen doubt whether it is still possible to bring back the South into the Union; it would be to us no greater marvel than this Scotch manifesto upon the American Union and American slavery. The arguments of oppression are retailed by the mouths of abolitionists. They strike the freemen of the North with weapons forged by the deadliest enemies of human freedom. Two years since Scotchmen would hardly give a brother's hand to any minister from

a slaveholding State; and now they reiterate the arguments, endorse the policy, defend the rebellion, and speak soft words about "the peculiar institution" of these self-same States. We ask, in wonder, what has wrought so marvellous a change? Of course they do not defend slavery in the abstract; they only defend the policy which traitors and rebels have adopted in order to extend and perpetuate human bondage. Of course they do not defend the wholesale plundering of government property, the unequalled perjury and the violent measures of the South, in the outset of the rebellion; they even say that this foul conspiracy was carried with "insolent haste and indecorum"! Indecorum, indeed! the very climax of rebuke. Of course, the *North British* does not disapprove of freedom and of free institutions in theory; it only labors to prove that the Union has been the strength of slavery, and that the sole hope of rearing free republics on this side of the Atlantic, is in allowing a slave republic to be founded, to divide with us the continent. It declares in plain, round terms, that "*it solemnly rejoices in the dismemberment of the Union*". But its whole argument, considering its source and character, is worthy of more particular consideration.*

The *North British* states its case. "Most Englishmen . . . after some observation and much reflection, have arrived at the conclusion, not only that the secessionists will succeed in their enterprise, but that this success will eventually be of the most signal service to humanity, to civilization, and to the cause of universal and enduring peace." And again: "We see no grounds on which the continuance of that Union should

* The *North British* for May, 1861, has an able article on Secession, written, we know, by one who had studied the matter, and entirely different in tone and spirit from the article of February, 1862. It says of the Confederacy: "We cannot see any attribute of the righteous Ruler of the universe which can be exercised in favor of an empire founded upon a repudiation of the very essence of the Divine law, and the adoption of the barbarous and demoralizing institution of slavery as its central and controlling influence". It says of the Union: "It cannot be that the latest born of mighty Protestant nations, the most enlightened, the richest in the heritage of all priceless things, which sages, and martyrs, and patriots have bequeathed to the world, shall fail to fulfil her destiny". How changed is this *Review* in nine short months

be desired by any wise or good [*sic*] man, and we view its termination with the most sanguine hopes of advantage to Europe, to Africa, to America itself, and to the highest interests of humanity at large". There is nothing like making a good opening—putting the case on the broadest and highest grounds. The Southern States, in their rebellion, it seems, are really engaged in a great philanthropic, almost a missionary work. In breaking up this Union they are laboring for freedom and humanity at large. No power in the world is really just now doing as much for the highest welfare of mankind, as that band of conspirators, traitors and slaveholders, led by Jeff. Davis, Floyd, Toombs, Cobb, and Twiggs. Unfortunately for us, brother Scotchmen, we know these men somewhat better than you do. If they are really working for the highest good of mankind, it can only be as they may perchance be fulfilling the secret will of Jehovah. His revealed will, so far as we understand it, is, that we should subdue and seize these rebels and conspirators as soon as we can, and inflict upon them the dread penalty of outraged public justice. Every man of them is a perjured traitor and conspirator against a government that never injured or oppressed any one of them. It is of such men that you are pleading the cause, with these high-sounding generalizations, as if you saw the whole of future history, and knew the counsels of the Most High. And they also enlisted in this revolt for the avowed object of building up a slave Republic on this continent. It would manifestly require a good deal of "overruling" on the part of divine Providence, to make this subserve "the highest interests of humanity at large". We, too, doubt not that the revolt will issue in this; not by its success, however, but by its defeat. The expatriation or virtual extinction of the leaders in this foul conspiracy seems to us the most direct and feasible mode of making the slaveholders' rebellion do "signal service to humanity, civilisation and the cause of universal and enduring peace". Homer of old gave expression to the deep religious and moral instincts of mankind in view of perjury and treason :

"Whoe'er involved us in this dire debate,
Oh! give that author of the war to fate".
" 'Tis not for us, but guilty Troy to dread,
Whose crimes sit heavy on her perjured head."

The *North British* is somewhat concerned about the way in which we may receive its utterances and prophecies. It thinks it must be "mortifying" to us; it will "startle and wound us", if it speaks "the plain truth"; it must "be a bitter draught to those whose whole national life, from the cradle to the present hour, has been one unbroken dream of self-worship and self-delusion". And we are "mortified" and even "startled"; but not at all on our own account. It has not in the least changed our views about our own country; though it has considerably modified our opinion of the good sense and good feeling of some Scotchmen. It is their "delusion" which we sincerely deplore. And we wish to tell them with equal frankness and plainness of speech, that in our view, they have in this matter been made the dupes and mouthpieces of the most reckless and profligate set of political conspirators that were ever banded together against the most beneficent government, and in favor of the most barbarous system of bondage this world has known. No such corruption and proscription, no such violence to free speech and civil rights, no such wholesale murder or expatriation of those opposed to them, have been witnessed in any Christian nation since the Reformation, as are now found in the Southern Confederate States. It has been a reign of violence and of terror, with hardly a parallel. It was initiated to uphold a system, the most debasing even to the material well-being of a state, that can well be conceived; a system which oppresses a whole class of human beings, that their owners may reap fifty per cent of profit. And the organ of the Free Church of Scotland has been "humbugged" (*sit venia verbo*) into the advocacy of this inhuman Confederacy. How it can "exonerate its Scotch conscience", we know not. Had it been thus imposed upon in behalf of some pretended scheme of philanthropy, we might have fathomed the matter; but to us at present we confess that it is past finding out.

To justify its apparent change of attitude towards the slave power, there was needed some strong putting of the case; and that we have in the body of the article. The "argument" consists in first asserting that all discussion about the right of secession is "puerile"; then in reciting the causes that led to secession, saying nothing of slavery; next, in presenting evidence that the United States have totally failed in all the ends of good government, this country now being a moral wreck among the nations; all of which ruin, it is further asserted, is owing to the existence of a colossal Union, inflated and "grandiose"; so that, in fine, the breaking up of the Union will probably lead to the most beneficial results—among which will be the more speedy amelioration, if not abolition of slavery. "In the continuance of the Union we *feel sure* there was no hope for the slave; in its disruption we believe there is much." Such is the rationale of "the American Crisis—Resurrection through Dissolution".

It hardly tends to awaken any high expectations about the political morality of the article, when we find it averring at the outset, that all discussion of the "constitutional right of secession is purely idle and irrelevant"; that it is "simply childish" to enforce loyalty "in the name of a written parchment". Is this good Scotch ethics? Is there no such thing as the obligation to be loyal? Have "written parchments" ceased to have binding force? Be it also remembered, that all the State officers of the revolted States had sworn to uphold the government of the United States. Is there no sanctity in such oaths? Has the word perjury any sense? The *Review* adds, that to make any such demand of loyalty involves "an arrogant and unreasonable inconsistency" with the fundamental principle of the political creed of the United States, which is said to be this—"the right of every man to live under any government he pleases, to make his own laws and choose his own rulers". Did ever a writer on political ethics state an essential principle more clumsily? Who holds that "every man" can "make his own laws" and "choose his own rulers"? Who does not hold, that every citizen is bound to obey the laws and rulers of the state under which he lives,

whether he chose them or not—unless willing to incur the hazards of revolution by force? The *Review* utterly confounds two entirely distinct things—the fictitious right of secession, and the inherent right of revolution against an intolerable and oppressive government. The latter right must be conceded; but, then, those that claim it also know, that they must make good their right in open conflict with the government they renounce. The alleged right of secession, however, is a right claimed, not against, but under the constitution of a country. It virtually says, that the sovereign authority itself allows its subjects to throw off their allegiance at pleasure; that the Constitution contains within itself the elements of its own destruction. It was only a plausible sophism to smooth the way to rebellion. No government on earth could allow this right, and live. No clause of our Constitution hints at it; no provisions of that instrument have it in view. The pretence of such a reserved right is like the mental reservation of Jesuitical oaths. The States may indeed rebel; but they cannot do so constitutionally. If they attempt a revolution, they must do it, as they are now doing it, at their peril. Even if our government be called a compact, none of the parties have a right to break it except with the consent of the rest. But the people of the United States formed not merely a confederacy, but a Union. The States themselves never had independent political being outside of the Union.* The fact, too, that the crime of “treason” against the United States† is defined by the Constitution itself is valid evidence against such a pretended right. The fact that the United States laws are paramount in all the States is also conclusive. And the absurdity of the claim involves its own refutation. Besides, in the present juncture, the plea is useless as well as worthless. The so-called Confederate States appealed to arms,

* Of the States now in rebellion only four, viz. Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, were among the original thirteen. The rest were all made States under the authority of the United States. Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas, and Florida were purchased by the General Government. Texas was obtained by treaty. What antecedent, reserved rights can be pretended here?

† See Francis Lieber, Lectures on the Constitution, p. 29.

and made flagrant war upon the General Government. Illogical secession led inevitably and logically to rebellion and revolution. And the great political fact about this people is, that there can be here but one government, one nation, one Union. This is now the profoundest conviction animating the American mind. The real question is, whether that nation shall be a nation of freemen, or a nation that sanctions human bondage. If secession were for a time successful, it could only result in perpetual conflicts and attempts at reconstruction, until the underlying question of freedom itself were resolved. This generation has chosen to grapple with this question now, that its posterity may have a freer and more beneficent career. It is fighting against secession and slavery for the sake of good government and equal laws for all coming time.

The next point made by the *North British Review* is a recital of the alleged causes, producing what it styles "the accomplished and irreversible fact" of separation. Here it follows Mr. Spence, and the Southern agents of the Confederacy in Europe. These commissioners of the South, it is well known, at home made the anti-slavery sentiment of the North to be the fulcrum of the dislodging lever; but to gain the ear of England, of whom they had been the most bitter calumniators, they uniformly and shamelessly alleged commercial and geographical arguments, varieties of lineage, and general incompatibility of temper, as the moving causes of their attempted independence. They even asserted, that the North was never so ready to make all the concessions they required on the score of slavery, as at the moment of the rupture.

It is undoubtedly true, that the democratic party, and many conservative politicians in the Northern States, were for a long time willing, for the sake of the Union, to make any reasonable compromise, not inconsistent with the equal rights of the States, and enforcing the provisions of the Constitution. But the South demanded, not equality, but supremacy. It rejected all overtures, because it saw that the numerical and social superiority of the North was as certain as facts and

figures. Slavery in the Republic was doomed. Hence they revolted. But as soon as the North saw that the South was resolved upon separation at all hazards, then the very Union feeling which had made them eager to retain the South rose up with vigorous recoil against the slave system, which threatened the destruction of our national life. If slavery or the Union must perish—it shall not be the Union. And this is the formula at the heart of our crisis.

The other alleged reasons for disunion are manifestly incompetent or irrelevant. All these reviews talk fustian about the descendants of Puritans and Cavaliers; though if the South were all Normans and the North all Saxons, this is no reason why they might not as well live here in unison as in England. The South is chiefly agricultural, but so is the West. The loss of political power on the part of the South means merely the loss of the predominance of the slave power. The loss of “civil justice and social safety” also signifies, that slavery is in danger. The “animosities” of the people are equivalent to the antagonism of pro-slavery and anti-slavery. The fact that slaveholders were held up by the North to the opprobrium of mankind has of course its roots in the same system. But how can the *North British Review* in one and the same breath say, that Slavery was not the impelling cause of the rupture, and then assign, as one of the most potent causes, the fact that the North alarmed the South for the safety of their institutions? How can it consistently affirm, that the South seceded because it believed “that emancipation would be absolute destruction”; and also assert, that the North were at the same time eager to concede to them the perpetuity of slavery; and likewise argue, that secession is the high road to emancipation? The logic is as bad as the facts. And as to the tariff and free trade, which were to the English mind the most palatable and plausible arguments in favor of the Confederate States—the potency and pertinency of this reason are completely dispelled as soon as it is remembered, that the tariff question has not for twelve years had a paramount influence as a vital issue in presidential elections. The Morrill Tariff was passed after secession had been accom-

plished. The rates even of this bill are not excessive. And if the South should now succeed, it would be burdened with a staggering debt, which it must meet by heavy taxation, either on its exported cotton, for which England must pay, or on its imports, which would check the free-trade boasting.

The rationale of secession is much simpler, and at the same time lies much deeper than any such manufactured arguments. It lies on the surface and penetrates to the core of Southern society. No solution of a great historical fact was ever more direct and conclusive. The existence of slavery in the Southern States is, and alone is, the real reason for the attempt to found a Southern Republic. All others reasons resolve themselves into this, and this explains and gives force to all the others.

The nature of slavery itself, as a form of human society, irresistibly tempts the slaveholder to hostility to a government administered for the benefit of freemen. There are only three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders at the South, and only one hundred thousand of these own over ten slaves. The system is based on the anti-republican idea of the essential inequality of races. It creates a domineering class interest,* all the participants in which are firmly allied by a common material bond, and by the love of irresponsible power. Founded in might and not in right, it rules in the last instance by physical force. It looks with jealousy on the

* An interesting discussion on Secession in the Paris Society of Political Economy was reported in the *Journal des Economistes*, and translated in the *Evening Post* of New York. Mr. Mill, who was present, said, among other things: "The Southern States are mastered by a passion that blinds them. They are in a frame of mind which is the result of Slavery. Accustomed to exercise a daily despotic power over their fellows, they cannot bear control, criticism, or resistance. They draw a blind confidence from their heated and unruly tempers, and they so exaggerate their strength as really to imagine that they can bring the North to terms. Such is always the effect of the exercise of absolute power over one's fellow-man. The passion which inspires the North is born of nobler and worthier sentiments". Mr. Jefferson, in his *Notes on Virginia*, touched the root of the matter when he said: "The whole commerce between master and slave is a perfect exercise of the most boisterous, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other".

diffusion of education, and cannot endure free speech and equal rights. All who do not own slaves, the "poor whites" of the South, it degrades. It is instinctively opposed to free labor, for labor is equivalent to servitude. Such a system, of course, can thrive only as it is dominant. All that will not obey its orders must be ostracised. When it loses political power, its dissolution has begun.

This unholy system was fastened upon our colonies while under English rule, and in spite of colonial protests. In giving us the boon of independence, England also gave us the curse of slavery; a curse that has well-nigh proved the ruin of the boon. But all the Fathers of the Republic looked upon and legislated about slavery as an evil that must ere long be extinguished. Its very name was excluded from the Constitution. And it would have died out under the influence of free labor and free law, had it not been found a source of unequalled profit, especially in the culture of cotton, under the stimulus of the demand of British looms. England has thus indirectly done more than any other country to favor the consolidation of the slave power.

That consolidation was rapid and strong. The moral and Christian principles of the Southern States have undergone a total revolution within the last thirty years as to the rightfulness of human bondage. History has no more signal instance of the baleful influence of a single evil principle upon the morals and manners of a country. The contagion spread rapidly through the whole of Southern life and society. At the root was the "*imperiosa fames et habendi sæva cupido*", stimulated by the native and sinful love of absolute power; and this embodied itself in Southern life, until it "quite lost the divine property of its first being". Books of ethics and divinity were recast to meet the exigency. The conscience and religion of the South were forced into acquiescence with the unnatural dogma of the rightfulness of human slavery. And while England was freely using our cotton, with dextrous ethics it was also able to make the existence of slavery the grand reproach to our democracy. It thus supported its operations by stimulating the production of that material, which

built up the slave power ; and then it stigmatised slavery, so as to bring democracy into contempt, and thus incidentally help the cause of aristocracy. So curiously do human interests cross each other and intermingle.

Meanwhile the great Northern States, freed from the incubus of this terrible system, grew apace in numbers, wealth, and power, under the exhilarating influence of free laws, free speech, free labor, equal rights, and popular education. The two systems advanced side by side, and soon became the absorbing centres of political contention. The whole course of national politics for the last quarter of a century has hinged just here. The Missouri Compromise was acquiesced in through all the minor discussions about banks and tariffs. These being settled, the social question loomed up paramount. The moral destiny of the Republic was to be decided. Whether freedom or slavery was to rule the land, became the absorbing national theme. The final decision was staved off, by the skilful alliance of the Southern slaveholders with the Northern democracy—an alliance which well-nigh proved our ruin as a Republic. The South struggled with desperation to retain its control of national politics. The admission of Texas, however, was counterbalanced by the admission of California. The Fugitive Slave law was reinvigorated ; but it aroused Northern freemen. The Missouri Compromise was struck down ; but that made Kansas the battle-field of the contending hosts. The three last presidential elections were fought under the impetus of the demand to extend the slave power. In consequence of the growing numbers of the North the result was inevitable. Under Buchanan's treacherous administration the South was prepared for disunion by members of the Cabinet. Lincoln was elected on the issue of slavery or freedom in the territories. And then the South seceded. The line of secession was drawn by the strongest slaveholding (the Cotton) States ; and the Confederate power at once planted its armies in the Border States.

This has been the general course of history. And it is a demonstration of the position, that slavery, and slavery alone,

is at the root of this rebellion. And the same history likewise shows that England has all along been involved in the course of these events ; first by fastening the system upon us ; then, fostering it by its manufactures, at the same time casting it in our teeth as an evil ; and finally, after slavery had accomplished its foul work of treason and rebellion, England, throughout the crisis, has given to the rebellious slave republic the benefit of its practical sympathy and of its prophecies. If the rebellion succeeds, it will be through the life which England gave it.

Additional confirmation, were it needed, of the position, that in slavery is the *fons et origo* of the Southern revolt, may be found in the distinct avowals of the leading advocates of the Southern cause—men who probably know as much about the matter as the contributors to the *North British Review*. Dr. Thornwell of South Carolina, the ablest Presbyterian divine in the Southern States, in an Address, which he prepared by order of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States, says (p. 8) : “ The antagonism of Northern and Southern sentiment on the subject of slavery lies at the root of all the difficulties, which have resulted in the dismemberment of the Federal Union and involved us in the horrors of an unnatural war”. “ The North cherishes a deep and settled antipathy to slavery itself, while the South is equally zealous in its defence.” The Vice-President of the Southern Confederacy, who even resisted secession to the last, Mr. Alexander H. Stevens, in a speech at Savannah, March 21, 1861, said : “ The prevailing ideas entertained by Jefferson and most of the leading statesmen at the time of the foundation of the old Constitution, were that the enslavement of the African race was in violation of the laws of nature ; that it was wrong in principle, socially, morally, and politically”. “ Our new Government is founded upon exactly the opposite ideas. Its foundations are laid, its corner-stone rests, upon the great truth that the negro is not equal to the white man ; that slavery, in subordination to the superior race, is his natural and normal condition. This, our new Government, is the first in the history of the world based upon this great physical, philo-

sophical, and moral truth." On the 15th day of last May, the Virginia Senate passed a Resolution, to be communicated to all the other Confederate States, declaring that "negro slavery was the fundamental doctrine of Southern civilization". The most philosophical historian of America is not, we rejoice to say, a Southern man either in locality or sympathy; but he is as much entitled as any one to be heard on a question involving the largest and truest induction from the most complicated series of facts. In his able address, on the anniversary of the birthday of Washington, Feb. 22, 1862, he distinctly says: "Slavery has forced upon us the issue, and has lifted up its hand to strike a death blow at our existence as a people. It has avowed itself a desperate and determined enemy of our national life, of our unity as a republic, and henceforward no man deserves the name of a statesman who would consent to the introduction of that element of weakness or division into any new territory, or the admission of another slave State into the Union."

In the light of such statements and testimony, and of the undeniable facts of history, what can be said of the reckless assertion of the *North British Review*, that "we do not know which to be amazed at most—the audacity which, on one side, has claimed our [England's] anti-slavery sympathies on behalf of the Unionists, or the simplicity, on the other, which in the face of notorious history has listened to the claim"? In view of the plainest teachings of history, are not both the "audacity" and the "simplicity" to be found with those who have been befooled into the belief, that the North is the great upholder of the slave system, and that the South will be best prepared for emancipation by establishing a republic, as Mr. Stevens so pointedly avers, with slavery as "its corner-stone"? We may rightly have compassion for those who are involuntarily involved in the guilt of the system of slavery. We may even find palliation for such as are compelled, against their old convictions, to do it homage on its own soil in the hour of its ferocious triumphs over all free speech and free thought; they are overborne by the frenzy of an infuriate mob.

But those in England and Scotland who, from the mere calculations of commercial gain, or the dislike of our democracy, have lent themselves to the defence of this fearful system of oppression and of wrong, who have defended the South alone, and only vilified the North in the whole progress of this intense struggle, richly deserve the indignation which is so deeply and widely felt for their apostasy to freedom, and for their complicity with slavery. The lowest depth of their humiliation and their righteous retribution will be reached, when the Republic, which they have tried to alienate, shall have prevailed, and the slave-power, which they have courted, shall be hopelessly defeated; for then the conspirators and their abettors will be involved in a common disgrace. Not even the paltry anticipated commercial gain, not even the heartless triumph over the downfall of a great Republic, will remain to compensate them for their recreancy to the cause of constitutional government and human freedom in the hour of its trial.

It will hardly be worth while to follow the *North British Review* in detail through its calumnies of the North and its eulogy of the South. Some of its assertions and prophecies have become ridiculous in the light of recent facts; as, *e. g.*, that the Southern army is "very much superior"; "better disciplined, better led"; consisting in large proportion "of gentlemen and men of substance"; "single companies are worth three and four millions"—in Confederate stocks? The Northern army is "made up to a very considerable extent of Irish and Germans"; that is, of the same stuff of which good European armies are made; and, besides, authentic enumeration shows that not more than twenty-five per cent are of foreign birth, and that the larger part of these are naturalized citizens. Most of its officers are "electioneering jobbers"; very few "West-Point men". But more than one third of the regular officers (six hundred and thirty-two) are West-Point graduates; and of eighty-six West-Point graduates, of the rank of major and above, only seventeen are in the rebel service, and over sixty in our own. Of our twenty-two major-generals, seventeen had a regular military training; and Banks, Butler and Dix, have shown that they were born generals. The triumphant

progress of our army and navy for the past four months, in a series of victories to which history has hardly a parallel, is ample refutation of the superiority of the Southern "chivalry". The admirable and comprehensive plan of a vaster and more difficult campaign than ever Napoleon undertook is sufficient evidence that there is good generalship at the head, as well as steadiness, discipline, and courage in the rank and file. Our finances are not yet in "a slough of despond"; no other nation, with the exception, perhaps, of the States of Holland, ever yet carried on such a war from its own resources, while governmental stocks commanded a premium.* That the "actual conquest of the South is simply impossible" reads now very like a false prophecy. And so of many another stale slander, which we can well afford to forget, remembering that it comes from those who never felt and knew the indomitable spirit of a republican government, struggling for its existence.

But we cannot so readily forget or pass by the malign and calumnious assault of the *North British* upon the general character of our Republic, and its attempted proof that we have degenerated at a rate unmatched in history, and become a reproach to mankind. For there is here a wilful suppression of notorious facts, and a gross misrepresentation of the whole character and working of our institutions. It is not many years since the Free Church of Scotland sent to this country for pecuniary aid; and now its leading quarterly represents us

* The *Daily News*, London, of May 20th, says of our financial condition: "There is nothing to be compared with this for grandeur in the annals of European finance. In the midst of a terrific struggle, in which every energy and resource of the country is needed, with an army of seven hundred thousand men to raise, pay, feed, discipline and equip, at the excessive cost which, proverbially, attends urgency; and with a numerous flotilla of gunboats and iron-clad vessels of war to construct and arm, excise duties reaching every article of comfort or luxury have been imposed without a murmur of discontent, and public credit continues to be unfalteringly sustained at a figure which the exchequers of monarchy seldom hope to attain." "This is public credit, the public credit of a self-governing people, one of the greatest and most notable results of freedom in our time; one of the most complete and comprehensive answers ever given to the calumnies of its foes." When President Lincoln came into office the United States 6 per cents were at 92, they are now quoted at 106.

as in a more debased condition than any other nation pretending to civilisation. It presents exceptions as the rule, and from partial instances makes unqualified inferences. "In præmissis Pygmeus es, in conclusione, plusquam Giganteus." By a most illogical and unfair argumentation it represents all our evils as the result of the Union. We have mistaken a "gigantic" for a "great nation", "confounded prosperity with civilisation", are "living in the shadow of an unparalleled delusion"; and, "under cover of the Union, have been degenerating at a rate almost unmatched in history". Of the great elements of civilisation, we have only "material well-being", but "neither social nor mental freedom," nor any "progress in political and moral culture". To call this "the land of freedom" is "a signal instance of presumption and delusion". "Probably in no country with nominally legal institutions, perhaps not even in Austria and Prussia, certainly not in France, is there less of real individual liberty of thought and speech." Citizens are "overawed and menaced by the intolerant and despotic majority"; they can "neither speak nor write, nor act, except as the mob around them please". "Few, who have not watched closely the progress of society in America, are aware how fearfully and to what an extent this social tyranny has demoralised all classes; how it has awed and silenced and rendered abject the thinking and dissenting few—how it has made lawless and brutal the paramount many—and how, between the two, it has brought the great and intelligent people of the Union into that condition of mingled ignorance and insolence, which, at the present moment, so astounds the world." "In nearly every element of political and moral civilisation, the deterioration . . . has been appallingly rapid and decisive. It has ceased to be the land of progress, and become, in a peculiar way, the land of retrogression and degeneracy." Among the points cited in proof are, universal suffrage; elective judges; rotation in office; rowdies controlling all elections; the allegation that no decent man can be chosen to Congress, and no great man can become President; repudiation by ten States; failing sense of honesty; increased brutality of demeanor among the governing classes; "lawless violence by mobs, ferocious

outrages by individuals"; "assaults and assassinations in open day, in public halls and recognised sanctuaries", etc. It elsewhere speaks of the "inflated fancy, the lawless temper, the overbearing arrogance, the low and unscrupulous morality, the vaulting and unprincipled ambition, characteristic both of the people and politicians of America" and asserts, that it "may all be traced directly or indirectly to that Union which is now dissolved, and which blind and desperate men are vehemently striving to restore".

Now, we may be an arrogant, vain-glorious, boastful, conceited, self-deluded and self-worshipping generation; but our worst demagogues, our most inflated and unscrupulous newspaper writers never penned such shameless, ignorant, and insolent caricatures of any other people as are contained in these and kindred representations of the *North British Review*. Its poisoned arrows fly back like boomerangs to its own hurt. Does it not exemplify the arrogance it blames, and the conceit which it chastises? May not our British lineage, after all, have something to do with our possession of these amiable qualities, to say nothing of our "aggressive foreign policy", and our alleged contempt for the rights of other nations? In the good old Jewish times, it took two men to make a Pharisee and a Sadducee; modern critics contrive to commingle the traits of the two. Satire alone can reach such cases, and the satire of Mr. Hosea Biglow is not merely theoretical:

"Of all the sarse that I can call to mind,
England does make the most onpleasant kind;
It's you're the sinners, ollers, she's the saint,
Wot's good's all English, all that isn't ain't;
Wot profits her is ollers right an' just,
An' ef you don't read Scriptur so, you must;
She's praised herself ontill she fairly thinks
There ain't no light in Natur when she winks;
Hain't she the Ten Commandments in her pus?
Could the world stir 'thout she went, tu, ez nus?
She's all thet's honest, honnable an' fair,
An' when the vartoots died they made her heir."

To reply, in detail, to the gross calumnies and ignorant

abuse of the *North British* would exceed our limits, and is hardly necessary. It is very successful in showing its animosity to our free institutions. The charges, in fact, are so vague and sweeping, that they can only be met by an equally broad denial on the ground of our knowledge of the facts of the case. As representing the general character and working of our republican institutions, they are absolutely and wickedly false. No human government is perfect. There are evils and excesses in every country. Ours are on the side of liberty, and in the direction of license. These we mourn and blame, and strive to amend. Abundant proofs of their existence can be cited from our own moralists and statesmen ; but how different are the wounds of a friend from the vituperations of a foe ! Bold, bad men may obtain local and transient influence. Ungoverned passions express themselves at times in evil words and deeds. Our evils are not to be ascribed to our Union, nor to our democracy ; they are rather the excrescences of our intense vitality, the rank luxuriance of our prodigious growth. And no people could have thus expanded and multiplied with less heat and license. The worst of our political and social tendencies are, in fact, derived from the influx of a foreign population, unable to bear with sobriety their sudden change to a free land offering such boundless opportunities. London and Paris would, to-day, go wild over speculations that New York merchants would not touch. And then, too, from the nature of a democratic country, the scum boils up speedily and surely to the surface. But the rapid disclosure of the evil also enables it to be more directly visited by the rebuke and check of a better public feeling. Society must be judged by its net results. And, here, in the general security and order, the peace and prosperity of our citizens, in their private moral and religious virtues, in their benevolence, sense of justice and intelligence, we fearlessly challenge a comparison with any people on the earth. There is less poverty, and there are fewer crimes, there is more manliness, and a much higher standard of morals and knowledge among our manufacturing and agricultural population, than in any other civilized nation. No such orderly, moral and religious villages and towns can

be found in any country as are scattered through our Northern and Western States. More than this, our system of public education is much more thorough and complete than in either England or Scotland; our abundant schools for private education, our academies and colleges, are chiefly sustained by private means and beneficence; and for religious instruction we give more than any other nation, and it is all a voluntary offering. Besides sustaining and educating our own population, we have also within the last ten years been able to receive and absorb over three millions of emigrants from Europe. Are there here no elements of a mighty and progressive civilisation? Not one of these points is hinted at by the *North British Review*.

There are evils in our political life. Too many experiments have been tried. Too many demagogues get office. Disgraceful scenes have been enacted in our legislatures and in Congress. But almost all of the violence on which this reviewer lays such stress—let him lay it well to heart—has been enacted under the influence, and to do the biddings of that slave-power, of which he is the apologist. Most of the mobs, the brutality, the public assaults in legislative halls, originated with this desperate class, which we are now reducing to subjection. It is not the Union, it is not democracy, but it is the fell and barbarous spirit of slavery striving to get control of this Union and of democracy, which has brought this shame upon us. When we conquer this power, we conquer the main spring of lawlessness in our political life.

And can no good men get into power? And can no great man be elected President? We would not exchange President Lincoln, as a wise and honest ruler, for any man now crowned in Europe. We would not exchange his Cabinet, for honesty and capacity, with any existing European Cabinet. There are many men out of Congress, who are wiser, better, and more cultivated than many who are in Congress. But our present Congress, freed from the domineering and boastful Southern delegation, has proved itself a sagacious, wise, and effective body of legislators. It has already passed a series of acts, (as the bill indorsing the President's Emancipation message,

the bills abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories, the Homestead bill, giving a freehold to every new settler on our public lands, the Agricultural College bill, the Pacific Railroad bill, and the treaty for the Suppression of the Slave-Trade), having more vital bearings upon the progress of mankind in freedom and justice than any English Parliament that was ever convened.

For ourselves, under a favoring Providence, if this wicked rebellion can be crushed, and freedom enthroned as our national characteristic, and slavery made local instead of national, we have no fear as to the future progress of the Republic. Difficulties and dangers will arise ; but if we can accomplish the herculean task of to-day, we may look with calmness upon the labor of the morrow. It is easier to reconstruct the wreck than to stem the torrent. Our British friends may be timorous about it, and prognosticate impossibilities ; but we, who have the work to do, only ask of them that they will not balk us by untimely meddling. When the revolted States return to their allegiance, it will be by their own act ; it will be because the Union feeling has triumphed. And it will, it must triumph in the end. Meanwhile we can afford to wait, and not be "over-exquisite to cast the fashion of uncertain ills". It is easy to prophesy impossibilities ; it only requires skepticism about man and about Providence. The analogies of the past may cast gloom upon the future ; but history does not always repeat itself. Our present triumphs have conquered some of these historical analogies. The social problem is an immense one, but neither society nor sociology is yet completed. *Ten-dit in ardua Virtus.*

As soon as commerce is restored along the Mississippi—and physical need and necessity will compel this—the spell of this disunion tyranny will be broken, and the slumbering Union feeling gather strength*. It will be a long, long time ere the

* A year and a half ago in the revolted States the votes stood 635,793 for the Union, and 486,554 for secession. In every State but South Carolina, the secession ordinances were carried after the arming had begun, and under the pressure of intimidation. In some of them, as in Virginia, fraud and force were combined. A determined and armed minority can effect a revolution in almost any State. England ought by this time to know that if an armed revolt be suppressed, submission is often followed by acquiescence. The analogy of history is here in our favor.

evils engendered by this rebellion can be wholly done away, before social and Christian sympathies can be revived as of old. But we are, after all, one people. This rebellion is the insurrection of a class. When the Confederate government has lost its army, as it has already lost its navy, it is wrecked. When that usurpation is dislodged, the bond of cohesion is gone, and the General Government, as before, will have to do only with the people of single and separate States. Restoration is difficult, but not impossible. It would be impossible, were we not contending for good government and righteous laws. It is possible, because justice and freedom must at last triumph in human affairs. And with all the undoubted and undeniable difficulties and dangers that hover around our future path, we would rather to-day, looking only for peace and progressive civilisation, for the blessings of good government and righteous laws, cast in our lot with this maligned Union, than with any other people in the world. England, France, Germany, Italy, have before them the prospects of more desperate conflicts than has the American Republic. We are already beyond the questions of aristocracy and democracy, of church and state, upon which these impending contests hinge. We are contending in the van of the race upon the major and decisive question of human freedom and equal laws for all mankind.

We need not enter into the argument by which the *North British Review* attempts to show what will be the advantages of a separation. We trust that this whole topic is theoretical. Some of the arguments have much more force in England than here; for example, that "we shall be reduced to growth under compression", "the normal condition of national life as seen in Europe". The greatness of our Union has been the cause, it alleges, of all our evils, has given us "the fatal and depraving sense of omnipotence"; whereas, if we are conveniently divided into six republics, for which there is quite enough room, this will "sanify our grandiose imaginations". We shall also be obliged to keep up armies and navies, and hold one another in check, and that will prevent us from turning our attention

to our neighbors and to Europe, while at the same time it will have the advantage of letting Europe come and do on this continent pretty much as it chooses. This separation, too, argue our friends, with a shrewd eye to the main chance, will, in conclusion, "necessitate free-trade", and make America "accept England's ordinary mode of payment". This explains itself. As to the other reasons, they are doubtless very good from the European standpoint; but this contest is an American affair, begun here, and to be ended here. These European reasons and arguments will not have, and ought not to have, any influence upon the actual result; or rather, so far as America is concerned, they are irresistible against the desirableness of a separation. We do not want, nor ought we to have, any more European colonies on this Western continent, least of all monarchical institutions. We firmly believe that this land is destined to work out the problem of republican institutions. We are not quite ready to be split up into such fragments of states as are in constant conflict in Central America, inviting foreign intervention. Had it not been for our Union, Europe would long since have interfered effectually with them. Too long already has Europe, and especially England, looked upon this land as if it were a semi-civilized region, to be used for its own benefit. Spain has taken advantage of our rupture to seize upon St. Domingo. Would France have ever dared to send an army to Mexico, under the pretence of paying Jeker & Co.'s exorbitant claims, but really, as it seems, for the sake of military occupation, and to attempt to enthrone a monarch, if we had not been involved in a civil war? Would England's Secretary for Foreign Affairs have ever written a note, in which he declared his disapproval of the whole French procedure, and ended with inglorious protestations of continued amity towards the Emperor, unless France and England were both willing to see the attempt to establish a monarchy successful upon our borders? unless they believed that the victory of the South would also give them an ally against the North? Had these powers any just reason for their foray upon Mexico? While carrying on such a war merely to recover a debt, are they to be at the same time blaming us for making war on the South

in self-defence, and to preserve the nation itself from ruin? Does not the whole course of events demonstrate, that if we become two nations, we shall inevitably be mixed up in conflicts with European powers? What England terms our offensive and aggressive foreign policy, has been our perpetual attempt to restrict the extension of European influence upon this continent. If the South were to become independent of us, it would become a commercial dependent upon England and France, and be ever ready to prompt or aid them, to the detriment of the North. For the sake, then, of peace with the nations of the earth, we must remain one people. Only as we are one, can we dissipate the dreams of Spain about regaining her lost possessions; make England content with what it already has; and give to France proper notice to keep its armies where they may be of some benefit to mankind. Mr. Seward's circular letter of March 3d, 1862, addressed to the American legations abroad, indicates the fixed policy of the American people; "a monarchical government established in Mexico, in the presence of foreign fleets and armies . . . has no promise of security or permanence". "It would be practically the beginning of a permanent policy of armed intervention by monarchical Europe, at once injurious and inimical to the system of government adopted by the American continent." "It is enough to say that in the opinion of the President, the emancipation of the American continent from the control of Europe has been the principal character of the past half century. It is not probable that a revolution in the opposite direction can succeed in the age which immediately follows this period", etc.

Thus do the reasons, which to an Englishman are most potent in favor of our separation, become to us strong arguments for the maintenance of our Union unimpaired. Thoroughly convinced that we have a great work to do for humanity and civilisation, we do not want to be hindered in it by the danger of ceaseless conflicts with foreign powers. The only mode in which we can keep them from their ambitious projects, is by presenting to them a strong and united front. "United we stand, divided we fall."

This of itself were sufficient argument, on the highest ground of national politics, for putting forth all our strength in the present exigency, to crush the rebellion which aims at our subversion. But there are other and equally cogent reasons.

Foremost among these is the demonstration of the fact, that a free government has sufficient power and vitality to maintain itself against internal insurrection, to execute with vigor the laws enacted in a constitutional way, to preserve unimpaired, in its rightly majesty, the legal will of the people. The great danger of a republic, it has been wisely said, is from within. Where all are free, there is hazard of the triumph of lawlessness. Can the supremacy of law be reconciled with the existence of freedom? Does not democracy irresistibly tend to anarchy? These are grave questions. And the great occasion has come for trying them—the test of the might of a republic. Had we succumbed to the rebellion, all Europe would have said, See the inherent weakness of a democracy; the colossal fabric tumbles into ruins at the first touch of the insurgent; and all Europe might have been tempted to try on us the same experiment. Now, when we resist the revolt that would compass our ruin, many Europeans cry out against us, because we repel arms by arms, and use force to coërcé freemen. But meanwhile they may be also learning that a republic recognises the authority of government as well as the rights of individual freemen, and holds the latter subject to the former. Mr. Mill has well said, that “we should be justly exposed to the pity and disdain of posterity, if we abandoned the contest while any means of carrying it to a successful issue remain”. And Europe must, we think, by this time be convinced that here is strength as well as freedom, a strength in proportion to our freedom. An army of three quarters of a million of men has been raised, equipped and sustained; a navy has been created sufficient to blockade three thousand miles of coast, and to storm every fort on the coast and the Mississippi; our annual expenditures have risen from seventy-five to five hundred millions; all this money and all these men have been freely given to the good cause; and yet the resources of the land and the power of the nation have only just begun to be

developed. In all the Northern States there has been no lack of food or raiment; there has been no outbreak; crime has decreased. New York is as peaceful to day as is London. The land has been full of corn; labor has been amply employed; money has been abundant. The manufacturing population of this country has been benefited by the war itself, while the same class in England and France have suffered on account of the same conflict. We are a stronger nation this day in every element of general prosperity than we were when the war began. And this has been accomplished without the aid of a dollar or a man from any foreign power; the only doubt about its being accomplished was in the possible intervention of those powers to aid our foe. We are an independent, self-sustaining and even prosperous nation, in the midst of one of the most tremendous civil contests that has ever been waged. Thus are we demonstrating the power and the resources of a free Republic.

Another reason for maintaining the integrity of our Union is found in the fact, that in everything but slavery the people of these States have, and can have, only one national life. One of the strongest tendencies of modern society and history is in the direction of national unity; the reünion of fragments of the same race, and the union of those having the same speech, customs, and laws. This tendency seems likely in future to control history more than ever. A common national life is a sacred reality, and an indefeasible trust. It is the very "mystery in the soul of state,

"And hath an operation more divine
Than breath or pen can give expressure to."

It cannot be voluntarily given up without national suicide. To abandon a grand and free national life without a struggle, would be an ineffable cowardice and treason to mankind, subjecting us to the just scorn and contempt of the other nations of the earth. It were equally abhorrent to the vital instincts of our past history. That we are, and must remain, one nation has been the deepest conviction of people and statesmen,

through all the decennia of the Republic. Washington, in his Farewell Address, told us that the Union was "the palladium of our political safety and prosperity". The foremost men of all our parties have echoed the same sentiment. The chief errors of many of our best statesmen have come from preferring the Union to all else. Love of the Union is now written upon the heart of our nation, with a pen of iron and with the point of a diamond. It is the animating idea of the present war. Men all over the land will live and die for it. An unselfish patriotism is prompting us to sacrifices, while it exhilarates with large hopes for the future. As truly as Rome felt itself to be the mistress of the nations, and Britannia that it was to rule the seas, and France that it was to be the arbiter of the affairs of the continent, so truly, so really do Americans now feel that they are to be one Union, one people, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Lakes to the Gulf. It is our national instinct, our American life. The very topography of the country forbids a separation. The same power must hold the delta, the sources and the mouth of the Mississippi*, and the whole flow of the Missouri. The North must have the Potomac, the Chesapeake, and Fortress Monroe. The highlands of Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Northern Alabama, and the whole of Western Virginia are inhabited by a loyal people. The very course of the mountain ranges forbids a division between North and South.

Our federal and representative system, too, is susceptible of the widest expansion, while maintaining the closest unity. If ever a country and a people were marked out by Providence as one, it is our country and our people. And whatever stands in the way of this, stands in the way of the deepest instinct of our nation's life. And therefore must this revolt be subdued.

"The land we from our Fathers had in trust,
And to our children will transmit, or die;
This is our maxim, this our piety;

* See Captain Humphrey's Report on the Mississippi, and the *North American Review*, April, 1862: "The beneficent action of the General Government alone has solved for the States of the Southern Mississippi valley, the problem of river protection, which is to them the very issue of life and death".

And God and nature say that it is just,
That which we would perform in arms—we must.”

Equally imperative is the obligation to prosecute this conflict arising from the character and aims of the rebellion itself. No nation can live unto itself; it is but a part of the race and must live for humanity. If it truly lives, it is animated by some high ideal. Within its lawful sphere it is bound to seek the highest good of all. Without a forfeiture of its own title to prosperous existence, it cannot allow any part of its rightful domain to be given up to brute force and barbarising institutions. The slave power, failing to achieve our subjection, determined upon the destruction of the Union, and the formation within our borders of a Republic, where slavery should be unchecked by our moral or political influence. Urging the right of secession, it attempted to establish a Confederacy of which the rightfulness of human bondage should be the distinguishing characteristic. When any community has become so far degraded in its political principles as to believe and act upon these two false maxims—the rightfulness of secession, and the rightfulness of slavery—and to attempt a revolt from a beneficent government on these grounds, the only practicable mode of dealing with it is to subdue it by force of arms. For the first of these principles annuls the possibility of government, and the second of them is a denial of the primary rights of manhood. To allow such a Republic to be consolidated on the soil of the United States, when we had the constitutional right and physical power to prevent it, would make us participants in the highest crimes against the human race. We contend not merely against treason to our state, but against treason to humanity. We are in arms to suppress a rude and barbarising power. And the war began not an hour too soon. Had the corruption, proscription, and lawless violence engendered by slavery, been allowed to extend itself unresisted for another olympiad, it would have well-nigh defied subjugation and control. The ship of state was on the breakers, when the guns were fired at Fort Sumter. Slowly but surely it righted itself in the darkest night that ever lowered upon this continent. It was a kind Providence that made the issue, when and where

and as it was. The fatal poison was eating out the very life of Southern and of Northern society and manhood. The depth of the disease is indicated by the fever and frenzy with which the long-prepared and long-dreaded revolt spread through all the Southern States, and by the crimes which have since marked their career.* The war is necessary to save the South itself from despotism and barbarism. Loyal citizens of the United States, like the heroic Parson Brownlow, have been hunted down as wild beasts, and endured untold calamities for their faithfulness to the Union; and shall the government for which they suffer leave them to be the victims of these terrible inhumanities? The barbarities inflicted on our Union soldiers by Southern troops are atrocious; their skulls have been made into drinking-cups, their bones into spurs and knife-handles, their gory heads, hacked from their bodies, have been swung in fiendish joy from railroad-cars and in triumphal processions. The helpless and wounded have been bayoneted on the field, and dead bodies dug up to be dishonored. The South itself has been the victim of a reign of terror. Wholesale conscription, already thrice attempted, has forced their whole male population between eighteen and sixty years of age into their armies. The stock of the Confederate States has been made legal tender at the point of the sword. Bridges, villages, cotton and tobacco, are ordered to be destroyed. Hundreds of those we took captive, and released on their oath not to bear arms against us, have at once reënlisted in their armies. Whatever is esteemed just, human and sacred among men, has thus been trampled under foot at the bidding of that corrupt despotism, which now bears sway in the revolted States. And all this is the legitimate and necessary result of the unchecked domination of the slave power. History does not record a more awful disclosure of the profound depths of human wickedness. The history of these Southern States for the past year, if ever written, will be written in tears and in blood. The progress of the war has demonstrated that it is a contest between essential barbarism on the one hand, and the progress

* See Mr. Wade's Report to the Senate, May 1, on the Barbarous Treatment of the Remains of Officers and Soldiers of the United States.

of civilisation on the other. And the manhood of the North has been developed in striking contrast with the inhumanity of the South. The progress of our arms in the South has been the deliverance of conquered towns from lawless violence, and the restoration of commerce, currency, and social order. Schools, even for the negroes, are already springing up, wherever we hold the soil. Our soldiers are every where stationed to protect private mansions, even of the disloyal, from being sacked and wasted. No armies under such provocations, and which had won such victories, were ever so abstinent of revenge. And this is because we are contending in behalf of social order and of civilisation. It is our purpose, of course, to subdue all Southern men in arms; this war, like all wars, is waged for the conquest of our foes. But we subdue them to substitute order for anarchy, law for force, constitutional freedom for despotism, and a purified for a corrupted civilisation. We subdue them to save the nation from Southern domination, and to save the South from itself. The only hope of saving the Southern States themselves is, by restoring to them the impartial blessings and wise restraints of our Federal Union.

And, in doing this, we also believe that we are doing a work for all the other nations. For were that slave republic established, it would be a pest to the earth. It could not be otherwise. Its dream was to found a haughty empire around the Gulf, to seize upon Mexico and Central America, and to clutch the gem of the Antilles. Many a Ponce de Leon would there have fitted out marauding expeditions, under the restless hallucination of finding the land of gold and the fountain of youth. Does any one, versed in history, believe that such a bold, bad power, begotten in perjury, founded in tyranny, with the oppression of more than half its inhabitants as the corner-stone of its policy, seeking by necessity new lands to restore the inherent wastefulness of its industrial system, would have subsided into a peaceful and stable nation? Is it reasonable to expect that the infamy of a treason worse than that of Catiline, would expand into an honesty and wisdom that would rival the fame of Washington and Franklin? Can the

Ethiopian change his skin and the leopard his spots? Then may a Southern fire-eater become a wise legislator, a Southern repudiator honest, and a slave republic peaceful and beneficent. Does anybody, excepting a secessionist, pretend to think that the prohibition of the slave-trade by the Confederacy was aught but a feint, or its pretended regard to England anything but a temporising hypocrisy? It requires all the assurance of a Southern Commissioner to Europe to say such things, and all the credulity of the *North British Review* to credit them. Philanthropists are said to be visionary men; did any one of them ever dream that the way to hasten emancipation was to establish a slave republic? and that the South, breaking loose from the North because it was anti-slavery, would become the admiring and docile pupil of English abolitionists? None that we know, excepting our sagacious transatlantic critics, who seem to have even a superfluity of that charity which beareth all things, believeth all things, and hopeth all things of the people "that will accept England's ordinary mode of payment". The theory of the *North British Review* has the merits of ingenuity and novelty. It says that the Union has been the chief support of slavery; that the North has "*raised half a million of soldiers, and voted five hundred millions of gold that they may again become a nation of slaveholders*"; and hence, that the restoration of the Union is the perpetuity of slavery. Whereas, if the South become a separate people, there will be no Fugitive Slave law, and the slaves will escape; the South cannot get any more land to extend its area, so that even if the slaves do not run away, slavery will die out; the African slave-trade, "carried on by the North", will be extinguished; Cuba would, in that case, have to mitigate its slavery, or "the black race, and with it the culture of sugar, would die out". "In either case, a terrible blot on civilisation would be wiped away, and—*our* West-India possessions will largely profit by the change!" And, then, too, the South, being made up so largely of "men of education, of letters and of refinement", would, of course, do the right thing, and "the euthanasia of slavery" would come. It seems a pity to dissipate such a delightful vision, in

which historic speculation, mild philanthropy, and a fitting regard to "our West-India possessions" are so pleasantly commingled. But, judging after the manner of men, it certainly looks quite as probable that emancipation would be more speedy under the programme of President Lincoln's emancipation message, than under the influence of Vice-President Stevens' pro-slavery speculations about the new civilization, founded in the inequality of races. If the North conquer, the national power of slavery is subdued; would it not be quite as likely to be hemmed in and die under that regimen, as in a Confederacy in which all else should be made subservient to it? Or does the lust of power decrease in proportion as it is gratified? And is it quite certain that Mexico would be left in peace, and that Cuba and the South, together, could not and would not carry on the slave-trade? And, besides, who can imagine that the Confederacy, after it became independent, would at once begin to do, willingly, what it seceded that it might not be compelled to do—that is, give up its ambitious projects and free its slaves? Is it not illogical, not to say absurd, for it to go off and do, what it went off because it did not want to do? Has it involved thirty-two millions of men, and led to the sacrifice of a hundred thousand lives, and aroused all its hate, and put forth all its power, on such an issue, and for such an end? And does the *North British Review* hope to blind others as itself is blinded, and to make them believe what it cannot itself believe, if it has sense or reason left? We may be here living, as it so decorously alleges, "in the midst of an unparalleled delusion"; but being ourselves in the strife, and aware of the stake, we know that the South is terribly in earnest, and earnest because it is logical, and logical only because it is maddened by the hope of establishing a Confederacy, where slavery shall be perpetuated. And we war against it because such a State, once founded, would lead to endless conflicts, and become a scourge to the nations of the earth; unless the race is to recede, and its progress to become a progress in injustice and not in freedom under law. And here is the awful responsibility of the issue now presented to this nation. It is fighting a battle for

the nations of the earth, in the name of whatever is best and holiest in the past, and for the undying benefit of all coming time. And God be thanked that we have not faltered, though England deserted us in the crisis of our fate. By her sympathy she sustained this rebellion; had it not been for her, it would long since have died out. But the delay of the avenging Deity is often terrible. Every month that this war is protracted, and the more desperate the resistance of the slaveholder, the stronger is the hope for the slave, the more sure is emancipation to do its work. The sacrifices of freemen will be the gain of those in bonds; the higher race is here living and acting for the abject and oppressed as never before. And this sublime Christian principle is part and parcel of this war; and so it is a war for the highest good of mankind.

Other considerations might easily be added to show that a necessity is laid upon us for pressing this unholy rebellion to its final issue. For on this point the heart of this people is resolute, whatever foreign governments may meditate in the way of intervention — and we see that our firm and noble friend De Gasparin, in his latest work, still warns us of this danger. It would be a sad day for us if this menace should be fulfilled; but might it not also be an evil day for the power that should attempt it? This nation is still in its youth; its boundless resources we have just begun to touch and handle with manly vigor. For food, and money, and manufactures, and all the implements of war, it is now absolutely independent of any power in the world. This war has proved that it has even a surplus of the material out of which the best armies are made. Its navy is large and efficient. Nor do we lack the *nervi belli, infinita pecunia*. Foreign intervention, too, would necessitate emancipation; and these two causes combined would arouse our people to the most intense and determined exertions. And whatever be our present dangers and trials, our future destiny as a great maritime, commercial, and naval power is unquestionable. The United States must have the hegemony on this Western continent. If European nations wish to make us at once a

first-rate military and aggressive power, the surest road to this will be their intervention. Even if they should impede and cripple us for a time—the time must be short; for we are only on the threshold of our growth and career. In a few years—a brief span in a nation's life—we may be strong enough to dictate our own terms, and those terms would not be easy to the power that should now interfere in our domestic affairs. The *North British* expresses its joy that we have ceased to be a peaceful and prosperous people, and that we are coming to adopt the European restraints and burdens of large armies and navies. Will England esteem us any less an object of dread, when we have an army larger than its own, and a more formidable navy? We should not have raised them, but for its encouragement to the South.

The *British Quarterly Review* warns us, that it will be dangerous for us to try England's "forbearance" much longer, and that "if the future in this respect is to be as the past, there CANNOT be peace". Such threats would have seemed more valorous two years ago than they do now; will they be repeated two years hence? If so, it may be found that this country is in no mood to endure in silence the dictation of Great Britain. For the last time has a British Secretary of State catechised us about sinking stones to aid the blockade of our own harbors. A change has come over us, because a change has come over England. There is here no desire for war, our national policy is peace; but there is a calm and strong conviction as to the evil we have suffered in consequence of England's want of fidelity to the cause of freedom; its apparent willingness to press us down and press us to the wall when we were thought to be weak; and especially its joy, so openly and generally expressed, at the rupture of our Republic. Roman moralists forbid us to rejoice over a fallen foe; could not a Christian people hide its exultation over a fallen friend, and a friend fallen for its fidelity to the cause of freedom and humanity? To befriend us would not have cost England a cent, nor a man, nor even its consistency. It had a golden opportunity to be faithful to the cause of good government and of human freedom, such an opportunity as cannot be re-

called, for the past is irrevocable. It chose the seeming advantage, and greeted us, while we were in the thickest of the fight, with reproaches and menace. On the score of utility, it committed a blunder; on the score of justice, it was faithless to its own history and to the claims of humanity itself.

If we are successful, we shall doubtless find that we have many a friend in England, Scotland, and Ireland; they will come forth from their hiding places, and tell us that their prayers have been heard and their prophecies fulfilled. And we will thank and bless all these for all they have done for our cause. But the strong and mighty men who have maligned us cannot retreat behind these silent Christian souls, and let them say that they speak in the name of England. We have heard and know what that voice is, and this generation will never forget it. Many an old tie is sundered, and grateful and hallowed memories have become dimmed. We have been unduly sensitive to all that was said of us in the old world; we yearned for sympathy from old England as from no other land; and when we came into the deep waters, and tribulation passed over us in our deadly strife for the cause which we believed to be so dear to our mother land, we thought in our inmost souls that she would speak as she never spake before to vindicate the majesty of law and the rights of freedom. And at her rebuke the front of treason would have quailed. And never shall we, can we forget the speechless hour when we were compelled to believe that all this confidence was vain; that treason was shaping its plans in the hope that Great Britain would intervene in its behalf; and that the slave-power had just grounds to think that cotton was mightier than freedom in the freest land of Europe. Never shall we forget the darkness that brooded over the land, when it was feared that England would force us into a strife; nor the immeasurable relief that ensued, when this black cloud was driven from the sky. The sun again shone down upon us; and never since that time have we doubted of the triumphant success of our national cause—the cause of liberty and law. And ever since that time have we been a truly independent people. We have our own work to do.

England's wisdom cannot understand it, and from England's power we can expect no aid.

As Christian men we deeply regret this loss of mutual confidence, and this sundering of sacred ties; but we cannot forget that it was in the power of the Christian men of England and Scotland to have prevented all this, and they did not use their power. As Christian men we respond as cordially as ever to all that is noble and generous in the heart and life of our brethren in the old world. And we fervently pray, that these sympathies may assuage the bitterness of our disappointment and lead England to better and wiser thoughts and words. But as Americans and as men we have felt to the quick the disparagements and reproaches that have been heaped upon the country we love by those that have made and ruled the public opinion of England, by its leading journals and reviews, at the time when we were passing through the crisis of our destiny as a nation. Those that have thus wronged and assailed our country, have wronged and assailed all of us. The attack has made us bind it closer to our hearts, as our conflicts have made us stronger in its defence. Every word spoken against us in Great Britain has led us to scan more closely and to prize more dearly the free institutions and the sacred Union, which have been slandered by ignorance, defamed by jealousy, and traduced by those who dread the growth and prosperity of democratic governments. While we lament the license of some of our public journals, and rebuke the lawlessness of demagogues and profligate men, and clearly see the perils to which our very freedom exposes us, we also see and know, that these are the excesses of the few, the sins of individuals, and do not express the temper of the State or indicate the destiny of our Republic. We venerate and confide in that imperial Republic as never before. We learned to love it more deeply and wisely in the hour of its calamity than we ever did in the zenith of its prosperity. It was riveted to our hearts when traitors struck down our flag, and foreigners rejoiced in our downfall. And now, when its banner floats proudly in triumph over the sea and over the land, we doubly rejoice in its tried constitution, its wise laws, its unequalled freedom, its broad hospitality to the needy and

oppressed from all other countries, its schools and churches open to all, its magnificent public and private charities, its marvellous growth, its abundant internal resources, and its terrible power, when once aroused, to resist and subdue a rebellion that would have defied the skill and might of every European monarchy or empire. In all this we rejoice, because it seems to indicate the progress and perpetuity of free government and righteous laws, and that a divine Providence is guiding the course of history to wise and beneficent ends.

P. S.—Earl Russell and Lord Palmerston are reported to have declared in Parliament, June 13, that there had been no negotiations with France on the question of “mediation” in our affairs. They still think it “inopportune”. (We shall have twelve Monitors ready in the autumn.) The same evening both Houses of Parliament became indignant over General Butler’s police regulations for putting a stop to the shameless conduct of the New Orleans women. Earl Russell intimated that the order “would lead to great brutality”; and Lord Palmerston denounced it as “infamous”. It seems that they had only seen Beauregard’s falsification of it, and supposed that it gave license to our soldiers. Why could not these humane and dignified legislators “the guardians of civilisation”, wait for the official documents? Then they would have seen, that the order (perfectly understood at New Orleans, where it has worked well) only declared, that women who behaved in a shameless and indecent manner to our soldiers, should be treated according to an old police regulation of the city, that is, be “shut up in the calaboose for the night”. But then, too, had not Parliament been so meddling, we should have missed the edifying spectacle of English “gentlemen” taking the part, in such gallant style, of the New Orleans “ladies”, who spit in our soldiers’ faces and insult them by indecent gestures. Neither our generals nor our people have anything to learn even from English noblemen about the honor due to woman. Such untimely discussions and supercilious assumptions only feed a growing indignation, whose influence will be felt for years and years to come.